

A CURSORY REVIEW

OF THE

WORKS OF CERTAIN AUTHORS

WHO HAVE WRITTEN IN DEFENCE OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE

ETERNAL

Sonship of Christ,

NAMELY THE

REV. RICHARD TREFFRY AND OTHERS.

BY THOMAS BLACK

But the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak, even as the Father said unto me so I speak.—Jon 12, 49, 50.

For I have given them the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them.—John 17. 8

Search the scriptures for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me.—John 5, 39.

But I will show thee that which is noted in the scriptures of truth.—Dan. 10, 21.

If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this Book, and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.—Rev. 22, 18, 19.

A CURSORY REVIEW

OF THE

WORKS OF CERTAIN AUTHORS

WHO HAVE WRITTEN IN DEFENCE OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE

ETERNAL

Sonship of Christ,

NAMELY THE

REV. RICHARD TREFFRY AND OTHERS.

BY THOMAS BLACK

But the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak, even as the Father said unto me so I speak.—Jon 12, 49, 50.

For I have given them the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them.—John 17. 8

Search the scriptures for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me.—John 5, 39.

But I will show thee that which is noted in the scriptures of truth.—Dan. 10, 21.

If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this Book, and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.—Rev. 22, 18, 19.

PREFACE.

The subject of the following investigation is an inquiry into the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of our Lord Jesus Christ, as set forth by certain Theologians.

The writer of the following pages takes the position that the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of Christ is not a doctrine of the Bible, and as such is a dangerous heresy. In attempting to prove our point in order that we do justice to them from whom we dissent, we propose to call in two class of witnesses, all of whom though dead yet speaketh in their writings, whose testimony should satisfy the living, namely:—All they who may come in our way while we investigate; who have wrote in it's favor on the one part, and the inspired writers on the other part. Meantime we call in all pious Bible Students as jurors to hear both sides of the evidence produced, that they may at least be fully decided in their own mind whether it is a doctrine of the Bible or an Anti-Christian heresy.

Men of comparative limited education, who have not M.A. or D.D. to their name, are by a great many considered incapable of taking up the question in theology, where the most profound linguists disagree on Bible doctrines. We think this is a great mistake. For when the question is confined to scripture doctrines, we think we have equal advantages for two reasons. First—While we give credit to the profound scholar for honesty and capability to translate the original language into our vernacular tongue, we have a right to believe that we may know as well in our own tongue what scripture language implies, as he does who translated it. And secondly—The man possessed of common sense under the influence of Divine Grace, is as capable, on the principle of his accountability to God, of knowing what God says, when it is given to him in his own language, as if he was able to read the command in all the different languages in the world.

The sole difficulty that exists between the combatants that have taken the platform on this subject consists in the different views taken of the pre-existent Divine nature of Christ.

Let it be observed here, once for all, that the author gives credit to the polemic theologians for unimpeachable piety and learning, and whatever leads to their difference of opinion, it cannot be attributed to the love of error or their lack of true piety to God. A good man may hold a wrong opinion owing to the prejudice of early education; entertaining an undue respect for ancestral instruction, and an unjustifiable neglect of scriptural investigation in reference to the disputed point.

Is it not high time now in the 19th Century, that believers in the Bible were of one mind as to who is the true Son of God. The superficial thinker may have failed to discover the discrepancy existing on this point between profound theologians.

They who entertain the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship, believe and teach that the pre-existent Divine nature of Christ was produced by generation in the eternal Godhead, and on that account the Divine nature of Christ should be called the external Son of God. The opposite class believe and teach

that there is no Eternal Son exhibited in the scriptures, but merely the Son of God, a Virgin Son, by whom God redeemed the world.

As this was a disputed point from the first age of christianity, we believe that the theologians who write in its favour can give a true digest of the doctrine in question as they believe it, and we are therefore warrantable in believing that they mean what they say.

A careful consideration of the various points raised by the defenders of the doctrine in question, has induced the writer to take a re-survey of the arguments produced in favor of the doctrine in question, which has resulted in a satisfactory conviction that the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of Christ is not a doctrine of the Bible, but rather an injurious heresy; and he ventures to believe that on those points upon which the differences are irreconcilable, he has not been betrayed into a tone which is unworthy the respect due to the frankest candour, and he also believes that the defenders of the doctrine in question have looked at it from a traditional standpoint, and have reached an untenable conclusion.

Therefore, that we may do justice to them from whom we dissent, and set the doctrine as entertained by them in as clear a light as their own words are capable of doing. We take the liberty of presenting a cursory review of the work of the Rev. Richard Treffry on this subject, and may touch at other authors whose authority he claims as we pass along.

Our mode of procedure shall be conducted by deducting quotations from the writings of such authors, for which we give them credit for believing what they write, and shall insert the reply their sentiments call forth as a contrast, which the pious Bible Student may examine for his own satisfaction, and choose for himself.

It would be a task as useless as it would be tedious for me to take up every idea that Treffry advances in favor of his scheme, contained in his book from page to page; but we shall content ourselves in taking his principal ideas as given in his own words interspersed on whatsoever page.

The edition of Rev. Richard Treffry's work from which we quote, was published by John Mason, 14 Cityroad, London, and sold 66, Paternoster-Row, 1837.

CHAPTER I.

HIS MENTAL EXERCISE IN COMMENCING THIS WORK.

The piety and learning of the Rev. Mr. Treffry is praiseworthy, and is indisputably admitted in all the Churches, and his judgment and explanation relative to the doctrine in question, is bowed to by many of his compeers, as proper authority for their implicit reception of the doctrine in question, to which we take exception.

He tells us in his preface "that his undertaking originated in no silly conceit of his capabilities—for he calls no man master; but in a deeply painful process of sceptical reasoning, which at one time led as near as possible to the rejection of the doctrine in question, but the thought of being at variance with the Church of God at large, was to him a strong presumptive of error. It was a great thing to have against him the traditional voice of 18 Centuries."

He here submits to be governed by tradition, and it is worthy of remark that it is from traditional sources he gleans the terms and phrases on which to base the doctrine in question; for the terms on which it is based are not found inside the Bible, namely:—Eternal Father, Eternal Son, Three Persons, Trinity, Divine Generation, Triune God. These terms arise out of, and are dependent on each other. These are sought for outside the Bible, in tradition, which he so much admires.

It is very observable that though he calls no man master, yet he very much regrets that he has so few teachers in reference to the doctrine in question. In his preface he thus laments, "That he has but some half dozen polemic pamphlets on the subject, which almost anticipated an *objection* to the present undertaking, which pamphlets are not sufficiently ample, critical and comprehensive, and have not secured to themselves the permanent interest which either the subject or their arguments merited."

So he rejects the capability of all authors who wrote before him, whose writings he had recourse to, as not having proved the point in hand, which he says on page 9 of his preface, "is evidently still a blank in our theological literature." It appears from this, that in his judgment the doctrine in question was never yet proved to be true, so he now offers his services to fill up this blank, which he says is evidently still discoverable in our theological literature, and to accomplish this he writes 500 pages to prove (as he thinks) that the pre-existent Divine nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, was produced by *Generation* in the Eternal God-head, and as such is worthy the name Eternal Son of God.

We understand that Mr. Treffry is held in a champion light by many of his Ministerial readers, and that he is considered by some of them to have silenced the controversy which arose on this subject between Dr. Adam Clark and some influential members of the British Conference, who regarded all those who entertained Dr. Clark's opinion, as being unfit to preach the everlasting Gospel of the Grace of God to the redeemed race. Notwithstanding it is written "let him that heareth say come." In confirmation of which opinion the British Conference passed an unprecedented test act on this point, and if carried out, no candidate for the Methodist Ministry will be taken into the British Conference who does not implicitly believe in the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of Christ.

And it appears that the adherents to the doctrine in question congratulate themselves under the bullwarks of the test act, and rest passive, as if they had nothing to do with the subject but teach its truthfulness as demonstrated by Treffry and others. But it is to be seen that Jesus speaks to every man who has the Bible. "*What think ye of Christ, whose son is he?*"

Under the master's authority we enter into this enquiry in obedience to his command, where he saith, "search the scriptures, for they are they which testify of me," (truly.) The doctrine that has not its foundation in the scriptures, and is not supported by thus saith the Lord, is classified by inspiration as doctrines of devils, doctrines of vanities, doctrines of men. In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men. We should be careful that the doctrines we embrace have the Holy Scriptures for their foundation, for all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for *doctrine*, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. 2 Tim. 3, 16, 17. Scripture doctrine truthfully preached tends to save the preacher and those who hear him. 1 Tim. 4, 16. False doctrine cannot profit.

Impressed with the necessity of great caution from the above considerations, we would now take a cursory review of Mr. Treffry's work above referred to, as his published opinions may be considered as public property, we, therefore, have a right to examine what they are worth on this subject, which stands an open question.

CHAPTER II.

HE ACKNOWLEDGES HIS INCAPABILITY TO EXAMINE THE DOCTRINE IN QUESTION.

On page 13, of his book, he makes the following acknowledgments, "of all the subjects which belong to this remote and inappreciable class, the nature of God is the most eminent and most inscrutable. It is not enough to characterize our faculties as feeble, we are absolutely *without the faculty* by which this lofty subject can be realized, and hence are as incapable of *independent* reasoning as is a man destitute of some bodily sense re-

specting the objects with which that sense is conversant." Again on page 456, he quotes from Novatian, and indorses the sentiment by inserting it in his book, asserting man's incapacities as above referred to, as follows :—"The secrets of the Sacred and Divine nativity of the word, neither Apostle teacheth, nor Prophet discovereth, nor Angel knoweth, nor any creature understandeth."

Now if Treffry was not in some sense thologically insane, would he have moved one step further in his enterprise, God having convinced him that he had not the faculty to touch or teach the subject more than he could lay his hand on the moon.

Now, if according to Treffry's truthful idea, neither Angel, Prophet, nor Apostle, nor any other creature knows any thing about the subject in question, where did it come from? Who brought it to us? The terms on which it are built are not in the Bible as above noticed, consequently where did it come from? The traditional talebearers that cannot give us teaching which scripture corroborates, when God is the subject matter. Is there any credit due to them? I think not, the doctrine in question is of this stamp, it contradicts the holy scriptures. This point we propose demonstrating in the following pages, and strange to tell that many who entertain this doctrine make the reasons above noticed of finite ignorance, their authority for receiving it, and say it is a matter of faith, and not of sense, and take the testimony of the individual who personally acknowledges his incapacity to know anything about it, and yet tries to tell us all about it, contrary to truth and reason, as a cause why he conceives of it as being an article of faith. I confess he must be suspiciously credulous who receives the doctrine on these grounds, for we have not come to that age in the world yet when men cannot carry falsehoods, and receive falacy at whatsoever expense. Who can be Treffry's pupil in his telling us all about, what he confessedly knows nothing at all about.

CHAPTER III.

THE SILENCE OF SCRIPTURE ON THE SUBJECT.

Now add to the foregoing acknowledgment of his entire lack of faculty to examine the subject in question, his acknowledged silence of the scriptures on this subject as he gives it on page 155 of his book in the following words :—"It will be sufficient if upon enquiry we meet with several passages of scripture which according to the most fair interpretation, *indirectly* or by *inference* suggest the doctrine under consideration. *This in fact is the only species of evidence which we have any right to expect.*"

Again on page 23 he says : "It is therefore highly rational to admit the doctrine *if conveyed only by inference*, and far from justified in rejecting it because *not stated in express terms*. We ought to *prepare* our minds for testimony of a comparative *low* and *unconvincing* character." It is no wonder that his elaborating the subject according to the above rules, resulted in his own conviction, for it seems he was determined to believe it, though scripture was silent on it, and all God's intelligences knew nothing about it, "and he being as incapable of independent reasoning as

is a man destitute of some bodily sense respecting the objects with which that sense is conversant." Does he not in the above, seem to charge God with unjustifiable concealment of the process of Divine generation, and an Eternal Son produced, in his act of supplying what may be called God's lack of service, by attempting to exhibit the secret by adding the term *eternal*, to the term *Son of God*. Is not this worse than works of supererogation? Does it not savour of adding to God's word? Is it not at least showing disrespect to the teachings of the Divine lawgiver, where he says, "But they shall not go in to see when the holy things are covered lest they die. Numbers 4, 20. Should not the judgment that fell upon Uzza for his forbidden care of the trembling Ark, teach Christians to pay due respect to the prohibitions of the Divine Lawgiver," as in Deut. 29, 29. "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but these things which are revealed belong unto us and unto our children for ever." The silence of the scriptures as a teacher of his theory he further acknowledges on page 14, as follows:—"Hence, however, diligently or devotedly we may avail ourselves of scripture instruction. The Divine nature will still remain shrouded in mystery, or rather in light which no man can approach unto." He acknowledged on page 13, that he had no *grounds* to use *independent reasoning*, and yet he acted perfectly contrary to this conviction, as we learn from himself on page nine of his preface. That he reasoned himself into the belief in the absence of human faculty and scripture guidance, that he found out all about Divine generation, what Angels, Prophets, nor Apostles, nor any other creature knew anything about, nor had the faculty to examine or understand. He says on page nine, "Thus was the present work originated; should it fall into the hands of any one in like circumstances he will find in it what its author was compelled to elaborate for himself, but what eventually proved perfectly adequate to his own conviction."

The course of independent reasoning which Treffry enters into which proved perfectly adequate to his own conviction, is to be seen on page 13 of his book, where he attempts to illustrate the reasonableness of Divine generation, and thinks he made it clear by an attempt to give a blind man an idea of the nature and relations of light and colors. "He, the blind man, is told for example that light is colorless; but, nevertheless, by the most satisfactory experiments it is proved to be composed of seven colours." Now what does this mode of independent reasoning amount to? Why, that his theory is as hard to be understood as for a blind man to understand that light has in it seven colors. Such is the metaphysical reasoning he has used to lead himself into the belief that though he has no faculty to understand the subject, yet he has found out to his own satisfaction what neither Angels nor man knew anything about, and says to this amount that its truthfulness is as easy understood as for a blind man to understand that light has in it seven colors.

Is not the above mode of reasoning one way of teaching falsehood, for a man to tell us all about what he confessedly knew nothing at all about? Where is the thoughtful Bible Student that could be

Treffry's pupil on these grounds. We think those that glory in Treffry as their authority for receiving this doctrine, must be thoughtlessly credulous. This is one illustration that he uses in filling up the blank in our theological literature, by which he pretends to have demonstrated that there is Divine generation in the Eternal Godhead, and as the result an Eternal Son produced.

How could Treffry or his pupils think that that soul-saving name *Son of God*, which is the only name given under heaven amongst men by which we must be saved? Faith in what name, is soul saving, or unbelief in what name is soul damning? That in reference to a right knowledge of that soul saving name, *Son of God*. It should take 500 pages of metaphysical reasoning of a gigantic mind, wielding all the art of classic metaphysics which is fit to mistify the mind of the common people, as on page 13 already referred to, where he presses his arguments so forbidding to the common sense preception of the unlearned, attempting to give a blind man an idea of the nature and relation of light and colors. "The blind man for example is told that light is colorless, but that nevertheless by the most satisfactory experiments it is proved to be composed of seven colors." Now here is an example which he felt he had need of using to mystify plain scripture teachings, and appears thereby to supersede that complete scripture name, *Son of God*, and to make way by artful cunning, that leads to the admission of the name *Eternal Son of God*. According to his own showing it is as easy for a blind man to understand that light has in it seven colors as for the redeemed race to understand what the term *Eternal Son* means—the one is as admissable as the other. Is there no danger here of worshipping we know not what?

The man convinced according to his above acknowledgments of his own incapacilities, not having the faculty to deal with the subject, and the utter silence of the scriptures on the subject, and yet leap desperately into the regions of past and unrevealed Eternity, as he tries to do on page 390. "The Father as God begets; the Son as God is begotten; the Holy Ghost as God proceeds. Does he not deny truthfulness to God's Prophet?" Isaiah 43, 10, 11. "Before *me* there *was no God formed neither shall there be after me; I, even I am the Lord and besides me there is no Saviour*." Is it not like a refusal on his part to be guided by the scriptures, which alone teach the true knowledge of God. "Search the scriptures, saith Jesus—and they are they which testify of me," (truly). "Vain man would be wise." "Canst thou by searching find out God?" "Canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection?" "It is as high as Heaven what canst thou do?" "Deeper than hell, what canst thou know?" but what God's word reveals. God's word reveals to us the different incommunicable attributes of the Godhead, such as his eternity and immutability, independence, self-existence, omnipresence, omnipotence, omniscience, &c., &c. These attributes are essential to the God of the universe, and they are consistently inseparable, where one is they all are. The term Godhead includes all the attributes of God, a few of which are referred to above; and to speak with reverence God cannot divest himself of them, nor can he communicate these attributes to an-

other. There can be but one such being in the universe? "To us there is but ONE GOD, and ONE mediator between God and *men*, the MAN Christ Jesus," "and this is life eternal to know thee the ONLY TRUE GOD, and Jesus Christ whom thou has't sent."

CHAPTER IV.

PROPER DIVINITY.

It takes all the fullness of the Godhead bodily to possess the man Christ Jesus with proper Divinity. Cal. 2, 9. "For in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." The doctrine in question denies him this? It gives to the pre-existent Divine nature of Christ, but the one-third of the Godhead, which is contrary to scripture teachings. The doctrine teaches that the Godhead was metamorphised, or transformed into personality, or three subsistences, the first of which existed as a unity, the second was produced by generation, and the third was produced by the united effort of the first and second persons, or subsistences of the Godhead, and the second has got the name of the Eternal Son. This is the only subsistence which the doctrine gives to the man Christ Jesus as his Divine nature. According to the explanations of its defenders there are two other subsistencies denied to him, namely, "the Father and the Holy Spirit." According to the principles of the doctrine in question; for the expounders of the doctrine say that he left the bosom of the Father, and was sent down from Heaven to die to redeem the race, and that the divine nature thus given to Christ was not self-existent, but was originated in the Godhead by generation. So proper Divinity is denied to him by the doctrine in question, by not giving to the Divine nature of Christ the attributes of eternity, self-existence and independence. This virtually denies the union of proper Divinity and proper humanity in the complex character of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The convictions that rested on Treffry's mind when contemplating the writing of his book, to which he refers in his preface, "which led him as near as possible to the rejection of the doctrine in question," which was the effect of Divine light. This followed him through every stage of his book, so that he could not suppress its appearance as a standing doubt remaining on his mind of the truthfulness of the doctrine he was defending. This doubt makes its appearance on page 154 of his book. He has got no further yet than an IF. He says, "In the Divine essence, therefore, there may be an emanant generation—and emanant it is IF it exists at all. Now for him to assert elsewhere that it does exist, is it anything less than irreconcilable discrepancy, for all who expound the doctrine agree that the Divine essence cannot be divided.

On page 252, while standing on the sandy foundation of a conjectural IF, he says, "here then we take our stand? Either the epithet before us describes our Lord's Divine relation to the Father, or his own statements and those of the Evangelists are untrue." To this may we not say the devil dare not call Christ a liar but through human lips. O, may God save us from bowing down to Rimmon in obedience to tradition?

CHAPTER V.

THE PROBABLE ORIGIN OF THE DOCTRINE IN QUESTION.

From all we can gather from the scriptures we conclude that the doctrine in question originated among the Jews about 738 years before Christ came : in the lifetime of Isaiah the Prophet, whom the Lord employed to speak forth the promise of a coming Saviour in a clearer manner than it was ever spoken before. For now the promise as spoken by Isaiah clearly implied the complex character of the coming Saviour, perfect humanity, and perfect Divinity, hypostatically united in our glorious Saviour. This is to be seen in Isaiah 7, 14. "Behold a Virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel, which is, God with us." And also in the 9th, 6, 7 of Isaiah—"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the Government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his Government and peace there shall be no end; upon the throne of David, and upon his Kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." This was the clearest promise uttered to this time of a coming Saviour, to be possessed of Human and Divine natures, as his complex character.

It appears that the Jews became elated looking at the promise, and it seems as if they have flattered themselves that the promise was spoken in the present tense, and that it was not wrapped in Prophetic Mystery, and that they could see right through it, and explain it in the following way:—"Unto us a child is born." Where is he? "Unto us a Son is given." He is wonderful! There is the Everlasting Father in the promise, and the Mighty God in the promise. The Son born, the Son given, must be a production of the Everlasting Father, in the Eternal Godhead, an everlasting or an Eternal Son. When he appears he will be wonderful. The Government on his shoulder. He will rule the nations. He will restore the Kingdom to Israel. He will be all that is desirable. The Everlasting Father, therefore, must have an Eternal Son which now exists in the Eternal Godhead. He will change times and laws all in our favor. His God-like power and appearance will subdue all opposition. We look for him as the desire of the nation. Come, then, conquer! We hail thine appearing! Hence they were looking for the wonderful one. Thus, in all probability they construed the promise into an Eternal Son, originated by Divine generation in some way in the Eternal Godhead. Their conduct toward Christ in after years seems to be proof that the above principle governed them. What other could prompt them to say and do to the blessed Jesus what they did but a mistaken notion of the coming Messiah, as to the glory, the splendour and powerful Majesty, and Godlike appearance he should appear in as the Eternal Son of God; hence, when the true Son of God did come, he was the very opposite of what they looked for.

It appears the prejudice of error when deeply seated has neither

eyes nor ears ; for God in mercy endeavoured to undeceive them by the very Prophet that wrote the promise which they misconstrued, as above noticed, and explained to them their mistake, and showed them that the Messiah, when he would come, would be the opposite in human appearance to what they expected. In the 53 Chapter he thus describes the true Messiah : " For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground. He hath no form nor comeliness, and when we shall see him there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs, and we hid as it were our faces from him. He was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely he has born our griefs, and carried our sorrows, yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities. The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed, &c." To this prophetic description it appears that the Jews paid no particular attention, for they might have seen in Jesus when he did appear amongst men, the above predicted characteristics to the letter fulfilled. Another capital error which the Jews fell into in the misconstruction of the promise above referred to, was the idea of Divine generation in the production of the Eternal Son; as they thought he would be a fac-simile of the Everlasting Father. This capital error also, God, by the same Prophet denounced in the 43 chapter, 10, 11, of Isaiah—That he may know and believe me, and understand that I am he, before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me; I, even I, am the Lord, and besides me there is no Saviour; and Isaiah 44, 8: Is there a God besides me? Yea, there is no God, I know not any, and yet the traditional doctrine in question attempts to recommend to us a begotten God, as the pre-existent Divine nature of Christ. This absurd doctrine, we think, originated as above described. In view of these things, who is that Bible student who will venture his salvation for eternity on a traditional fictitious begotten God? Eternal consequences are at stake. "If the Lord be God, follow him as his word directs, and renounce that tradition which contradicts God's word."

The Jews therefore took a wrong view of the blessed promise, and it appears that they would not be warned, or put right by the Prophet, but retained their views till Christ came, and because he exhibited not the glories they thought the Messiah would display, they rejected him as a deceiver, and crucified him as such. This was the first important result of the doctrine in question, it led the Jews to crucify the true Son of God.

The same deception to some extent has its influences on the adherents of this doctrine to the present day, for the defenders of this doctrine quote the opinion the Jews expressed in favor of the Divine affiliation, as one of their most substantial proofs of its truthfulness. Let us view the deception of this refuge of lies; let the believer in Christ point to the bloody hands and wicked heart of the Jewish murderer under Jewish authority, nailing my blessed Saviour to the cross as a deceiver, and hear Jesus say Father, forgive them for they know not what they do; and then say, was their opinion of Divine affiliation under which they were acting,

taught them by the spirit of truth or the spirit of error. Should we therefore take them as our exemplars in reference to the doctrine of Divine affiliation which moved the Jews to crucify Christ as a deceiver—if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into a ditch on this subject.

It is to be feared that in this nineteenth century the prejudice of many in favour of the doctrine in question, while claiming Jewish prejudices as truthful authority in favour of the Eternal Son, that sooner than give it up in favour of the Virgin's Son, being the true Son of God. Many of them would give their voice against him to have him crucified as the Jews did, if he lived on earth in this day. Hence, as before intimated, the Apostles saw the prejudice the Jews entertained in favour of an Eternal Son, and they knew that when the Jews would embrace Christianity, some of them would bring their Eternal Sonship opinions into the Christian Church, and use their influence to propagate them. In view of this the Apostles predicted that *anti-Christ would come*. 1 John, 4, 1, 3. The doctrine in question bears all the inherent marks of this dangerous heresy.

It is evident to the unprejudiced reader that every idea that Treffry can find among the Jews, Platonists, Gnostics or Heathens of whatever class, that favors the doctrine in question, he gleans them as if they were inspired truth, and it is not inspired phraseology he looks for, for this he acknowledges he has not; but he goes to the dark source of Heathen Mythology for terms and phrases where there are families of gods exhibited, one vieing with the other as to the preference attributable to their different deities. Greater and lesser, superior and inferior, one having authority to rule over and send on errands of importance, and subjective obedience in those delegated to obey, and this is the Hierarchy or rank of celestial beings. That is somewhat like a model in accordance with which the principles of the doctrine in question were framed by our ancestors, and handed down to us, enjoining on us to believe that there is greater and lesser in infinity; that there is inferior Godhead, which the venerable John Wesley says, "shocks our sense." This principle is plainly taught by the venerable Bishop Pearson, in his exposition of the creed, which is held up as a standard work for young ministers to be governed by. On page 50 of Pearson on the creed, we read the following sentiment, "That God is the proper and Eternal Father of his own Eternal Son." What is the eminence or excellency of the relation in general then? We may safely observe that in the name of Father there is something of *eminence*, which is not in that of Son, and some kind of *priority*. We must ascribe unto him whom we call the first, in respect to him whom we call the *second person*, and as we cannot but ascribe it, so we must endeavour to preserve it." This is undisguised arianism of the highest stamp, when believed in connection with the doctrine in question.

CHAPTER VI.

OF THE TRINITY, AND DENIAL OF HOLINESS TO THE MAN CHRIST
JESUS.

Treffry's mode of proving the doctrine of the Trinity appears on Page 438 of his book, he, finding that the scriptures don't speak plain on the doctrine of the Trinity, and not finding the term inside the Bible, does not labour much comparatively in favour of the term, but what he gives us appears to be a burlesque on Christianity ; for a professed Christian theologian to glean from heathen profanity, witty random sayings from a dark unhallowed source, uttered in the most wicked, blasphemous spirit, is highly objectionable.

What is thus referred to is found on page 438, and is as follows : " Before we enter upon the third century it might not be improper to quote a heathen testimony to the doctrine of the Trinity, which incidentally bears upon our present subject. It is found in a witty but profane dialogue intituled *Philopatris*, and ascribed to Lucian of Samosata, who flourished toward the close of the second century. Bishop Bull thought it genuine." Treffry endorses the following sentiment on the authority of Bishop Bull, by his inserting it in his book. As he says above, it bears on our present subject, it is as follows : " The interlocuters in this piece are Chritias a Heathen, and Triphon, who personates a Christian. The former asks, by whom shall I swear ; the latter answers, by the God that rules on high, the great, the immortal, the heavenly, the son of the Father, the spirit proceeding from the Father, one in three and three in one : regard *these* as *Jupiter*, and *think this God* ; shortly after Triphon begs Chritias to tell him what he had heard in the assembly of the Christians of which he had before complained, to which he replied : by the Son out of the Father this shall not be done."

The above sentiment Treffry says : bears upon our present subject, and is genuine, for Bishop Bull says so. The interlocutor says above to his fellow : regard this Father, Son and Spirit as Jupiter, and think this God." Here is the way Gods are multiplied by human imagination. Treffry says this is genuine, for Bishop Bull says so ; some Bishops have not the knowledge of God, this may be spoken to their shame. Such teachings might be received by Heathens who have not the Bible, but how a professed Christian Theologian with an open Bible in hand can receive such trash, is a crime that I could not charge against enlightened common sense, it must be light refused that blinds the proselyte. This seems to be the source whence the doctrine in question has been gleaned. Heathen Mythology and Jewish dreamings, a little modified, traditionally handed down, and received without due examination. For a Christian Theologian to use and boast of such authority, is something like going down to Egypt for the leeks and onions, in preference to the milk and

honey of Canaan ; and an unprejudiced Bible student who looks to the Bible as the true source whence true testimony of God is to be obtained, is forced to conclude that the above is worse than false, it is calculated to beguile the unwary and blights the interests of God's Church on earth. God's spirit cannot work with fallacy, and such doctrines are comparable to the building material of wood, hay stubble, it will not stand the fire of God's truth, and all such doctrinal material shall be burned up, and the builder's labor lost—Not so much reward as for the cup of cold water.

Ministerial builders should be guided by the example Christ Jesus gives, and be sure that it is not traditional fallacy, of human coinage they take, with which to build on Christ. For the terms on which the doctrine in question is built, are not found inside the Bible, namely : Eternal Father and Eternal Son, three persons, Trinity, Triune God, Divine generation. There is a snare in using terms the Holy Ghost never used, on which to base and from which to derive a doctrine, said to contain an article of faith, relative to the Redeemer of the world. Oh ! that ministers of the Gospel were as careful (and they should try to be as careful) as the blessed Jesus was. He gives them an example, which, if followed, would save them from the snares of traditional fallacy as above chargeable against the doctrine in question. The man Christ Jesus, tells us the source whence he derived his authority for the doctrines he taught,—“ but the Father which sent me he gave me a commandment, *what I should say and what I should speak.* Whatsoever *I speak*, therefore, even as the *Father said unto me so I speak.*” John 12, 49, 50 ; and also, “ but as my Father has *taught me I speak these things.*” John 8, 28. “ For I have given unto them the *words which thou gavest me*, and they have *received them.*” John 14, 8. And, awful to contemplate, the adherents to the doctrine in question will not receive the words Christ spoke, *Son of God*, short of adding the term *Eternal* to it, which tends to change its nature, locality and origin, which amounts to an imaginary being who never had an existence, as being exhibited by the inspired word. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. 1st Tim. 2, 5, 6.

It is evident that a doctrine which is not taught in the Bible, as the doctrine now under consideration is not, the defenders of such doctrine in their attempt to press the holy scriptures into their service, are invariably under the necessity of misconstruing scripture teachings. Treffry is caught in this snare ; on page 134-5 where he attempts to deny holiness to the human nature of our blessed Lord, “ he says the opinion that the designation, the holy thing, was confined to the human nature of our Lord. Beside being liable to exception on other grounds, it appears to clash with the entire preceding exposition. Since if conceded, the title Son of God can hardly escape the same limitation.” Behold the absur-

dity that shows itself here. The Holy Scriptures are denied, where he is called "the holy child, "thy holy one." He is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, &c. That holy thing that shall be born of thee ; and applying the term holy to the Divine nature of our Lord, as he does. He charges the blessed Virgin with not knowing that God was holy till the angel told her, and accuses the angel of telling her that her maker would be born of her, which is absurd. Such gleanings on his part to deny holiness to the immaculate Christ are outrageous ; he seems to see that if he admitted the designation *holy thing* was spoken of the human nature of our Lord, it would make the term Son of God originate in the incarnation, which he attempts to deny.

On page 136 he further misleads the unwary. He says "thus in his entire person, human as well as Divine, he is called God, and in the same comprehensive sense is entitled the Messiah. The mere complexity of nature is insufficient to account either for these, or any other of our Lord's titles."

The above is not true. For the complexity of nature in our blessed Lord, is sufficient to account either for these, or for any other of our Lord's titles. For he as our Lord Jesus Christ being possessed of proper humanity and proper Divinity, absolutely united in his own divive person, both the human and divine natures,—even all the fullness of the God-head bodily, not partially, but perfectly—hence on the grounds of the complexity of his *divine* nature, we find sufficient grounds to account for all the titles attributable to our blessed Lord. On same page more absurdity. He says, "The obvious reason why in his mixed nature he is called God, is, that before his incarnation he was a truly Divine person." If the term person here mentioned is used in accordance with the doctrine of personality in the God-head it is untenable. For the pre-existent Divine nature of Christ does not comport with the idea of personality in the God-head. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, not partially—no part left out by inspiration, as the doctrine in question does by tradition.

On page 354 he charges the Apostles with imprudence. He says "Had the meaning the Jews attached to the term been false—the most prudent plan would have been for such an appallation to be declined, especially as the Apostles could not have been at a loss for another which in the case supposed, would have been more appropriate." We say, had the Jews or professed Christians believed the terms *Son of God*, as the Apostles used it, it would be all right, for they meant what they said, and there was no other term could comport with his nature but Son of God. He had no human Father. God was his Father. He was a Virgin's Son, produced or begotten by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin, without male intervention, hence, what other term could be appropriate but Son of God. Adding the term eternal to it destroys its true meaning. Tradition does this.

CHAPTER VII.

AN ABSURD ANALOGY, DRAWN BY TREFFRY, BETWEEN GOD AND HIS CREATURES.

On page 156, he labours to prove his doctrine by drawing an analogy between the ineffable Jehovah, and his creature man ; and worse still, he argues the analogy is discoverable as existing between God and the brute. His proposition is, that as man was created with faculties in the use of which he is capable of propagating his own species, this was the image of God in which he was created, and that God is infinitely more able to propagate *his* species, than the creature is to propagate his. On page 159, he quotes from Bishop Pearson on the Creed Art. 2, P, 137, in proof that God is more prolific than animals, he says, "Animals when they come to the perfection of nature, then become prolific, In God eternal perfection sheweth his eternal fecundity." If this idea is true, how many Gods have we now ? Did Pearson or Treffry ever read Isaiah 43, 10, 11—" Before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am the Lord, and beside me there is no Saviour." Heathens who have not the Bible are more excusable in worshipping a plurality of Gods, than a professed Christian theologian with an open Bible in hand. Is it not idolatry to vindicate and worship a family of Gods produced by generation and production. The doctrine in question cannot be maintained short of this absurdity, which contradicts God's inspired word, and he seems to glory in man's natural capabilities to propagate his own species, and attributes to him a dignity on account of the fact that he is the instrument of calling into existence a spirit capable of religious knowledge. Whereas there is no more glory due to man on these grounds, than is due to any other species of God's creation. Man is generally as low thoughted in the act of propagation, as the ass or the swine. The holiest saint has no more to do in human propagation, as to calling forth an immortal spirit, than the vilest adulterer or fornicator that ever violated the laws of chastity.

He further says, "it surely then cannot seem extraordinary if the type of a human relation so eminent, should be found to exist in the Divine nature ; and *although by such a mode of reasoning we could not arrive at anything like ASSURANCE, yet APART from the direct TESTIMONY of scripture, we might SURMISE the probability of an eternal, vital, spiritual, divine production.* That in *singular and unapproachable eminence, there is in God the model of the noblest attribute of man.*" Are not these bold assertions ? Is there any true fear of God ; or regard for Holy Ghost teachings here ? He has no scriptural assurance. He has only human surmisings, confessedly so. Whether is it the spirit of God which taught Isaiah the Prophet in writing chapter 43, 10, 11, above quoted, or the spirit that actuated Tom Paine, that dictated the above sentiments ? Here he candidly tells us that we cannot arrive at anything like assurance, yet he ventures in his human surmisings as his sole foundation, without shame or fear, to invent such wonders about that God who hideth himself, and of whom we know nothing

but what his word reveals—a necessary part of which is found in Isaiah 43, 10, 11, and 1st Cor. 8, 6, and Mark 12, 29, &c., &c.

He further, in the absence of all scripture authority, and in a course of independent reasoning says on page 157, as if he was taking a look into the generating, and birth chamber of his family of Gods:—"As far as our information goes, any one of the persons in the Trinity might have supplied the pattern. There did exist some relation between these subsistencies, which was the model and original of an analagous relation in the human race—which was primarily contemplated in the Divine councils, and that with a certain speciality, the human power of spiritual generation had its archtype in the eternal Trinity. The intervening verse goes to confirm this view, for the sacred historian having stated the fact that in the image of the Elohim created he him, adds male and female created he them, a clause which anticipates the order of the narrative."

Now what does the above independent reasoning amount to? It just means that the Godhead exists in three subsistencies, each of them possessed of sexual qualities, and that they held their sexual intercourse together, analagous to the act of human propagation, and the result is an Eternal Son produced by Divine generation. This is what he means and teaches.

In the above mode of reasoning the subject of Divine generation is reduced to its most severe test, by Treffry, as being the order of God in the act of Divine generation, in the production of an Eternal Son. Now if this independent reasoning is found to carry self-refutation on the face of it, his doctrine is exploded and Divine generation is a farce, notwithstanding he being supported by his traditional compeers. They that Glory in Treffry's authority in the above reasoning cannot deny that Divine generation is dependent on something analagous to sexual intercourse in the Divine Godhead. It is therefore clearly deducible from the above mode of reasoning that Divine generation is dependent on something analagous to human propagation—that there was but one person existed originally in the Divine Godhead; if this is disputed we can have no Divine generation, for to generate that which did exist, is not common sense. Generation implies production as the result of sexual intercourse. Now the expounders of the doctrine in question assert virtually that the first person existed not as a plurality, but as a unity, and produced by generation a second person, and these two produced a third. This is the idea they attempt to give us of the origin of personality in the Godhead, hence their carnal independent reasonings sap their own foundation, for there was no possibility of such a production, owing to the *unity* of the only person existing originally in the Godhead. There was no mother with which to hold sexual intercourse for the production of an Eternal Son. The term generate is untenable here, and too carnal to be referred to in reference to God, but I am obliged to do so, being encouraged by Proverbs 26, 5, "answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit."

Beside his eternal unity, implies eternal sterility, which in the use of right reason logically carried out, stands in eternal opposition to Divine fecundity. Treffry don't begin at the right end of his story, he begins in the personal family already produced by human imagination, and says virtually that their intercourse with each other produced themselves. Is not this equal to asserting that the effect produced the cause : he says above "as far as our information goes any of the persons in the Trinity might have supplied the pattern." Is it of Father, or Mother, or Son ? "For there did exist some relation between these subsistencies." Who will be Treffry's pupil here ? Led by tradition to do violence to common sense and right reason, all expounders of the doctrine in question are in their defence of it found in some difficulty. Let the unprejudiced Bible Student look at the doctrine of Divine generation from whatsoever standpoint he will ! Its principles sap its own foundation. That but one person originally existed in the Eternal Godhead is a truth that all the subtlety, from the bottomless pit cannot transmute into divine generation. Men may allow tradition to deceive them with an open Bible in their hands to their own shame and loss, to whatsoever extent.

In the above Treffry compares, virtually, the God of the universe to a *Hermaphrodite*. (The term signifies an animal, or human being, which has the faculty of generation both of male and female.) This is the characteristic Treffry surmises God is possessed of, and ingeniously surmises that God pregnated himself in the production of an Eternal Son, without the least authority from the Bible. Is it not another Gospel—a counterfeit ?

His argument on page 157, endeavouring to prove that an important part of the image of God in which man was created, was a capability to propagate his own species, amounts to a virtual denial of universal depravity. It is evident that man retains all the faculties of human propagation. *If so*, what image of God did man lose in the fall of our first parents. Could the adherents of the doctrine in question tell us ? For they have not lost the faculty of human propagation. Treffry seems to think that God could not make man capable of propagating his own species, but for that he himself was also such a being that he could propagate *his* own species. This is carnal reasoning on the part of Treffry. Our worthy Poet widely disagrees with him where he holds forth the hallowed utterances :

1. God is a name my soul adores,
The Almighty~~x~~the Eternal one ;
Nature and grace with all their powers,
Confess the Infinite unknown.

2. Thy voice produced the sea and spheres,
Bade the waves roar, the Planets shine,
But nothing like thyself appears,
Through all these spacious works of thine.

x Three.

3. Still restless nature dies and grows,
From change to change the creature runs,
Thy being no succession knows,
And all thy vast designs are one.
4. A glance of thine runs through the globe,
Rules the bright worlds and moves their frame.
Of light thou form'st thy dazzling robe,
Thy ministers are living flame.
5. How shall polluted mortals dare,
To sing thy glory or thy grace,
Beneath thy feet we lie afar,
And see but shadows of thy face.
6. Who can behold the blazing light,
Who can approach consuming flame ;
None but thy wisdom knows thy might,
None but thy word can speak thy name.

All existences whether animate or inanimate that produce their own kind, God has made them so ; and none of them can take honour to themselves as to why they belong to such a class of beings, and the very circumstance of man propagating his own species, which Treffry uses as analagous proof that there is fecundity in the Godhead, might be easily shown to be proof to the contrary. If Treffry's speculations are true how many Gods have we now ? If Festus had as good grounds to say to Paul, Much learning doth make thee mad, would there not be some truth in it ? The wisdom and mercy of God are vindicated in the presence of his Church relative to his dealings with Treffry. Prior to his commencing this work, he was so powerfully wrought upon with impressions that the doctrine was not true, that he was almost led to relinquish the doctrine in toto. Meantime God wrought a conviction in his soul which he expresses in several parts of his book that no creature had even the faculty of soul to examine the subject, and that the scriptures gave no instruction as a foundation for the doctrine in question, and therefore man had no right or grounds for independent reasoning on the subject. Yet Treffry seems to have closed his eyes to all this light, and bounds into the investigation to fish out what neither angel nor man knew anything of ; and he tries with others to divide the Godhead into parts. May not this doctrine, so delusive, be that pointed to in 2 Thes. 2 7, 12, called the mystery of iniquity which doth already work. Its reception will not remunerate for the penalty it incurs.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE DOCTRINE OF SONSHIP AND TRINITY STAND OR FALL
TOGETHER.

Treffry says on page 20, " If objection be *valid* against the Divine affiliation of Christ, it is equally so against the Trinity."

This is a consistent conclusion of Treffry. There is no man can show in the language the Holy Ghost teacheth that these two doctrines are true; they stand or fall together. This Treffry teaches in the above sentiment where he says, "If the objection be valid against the Divine affiliation of Christ, it is equally so against the Trinity." The principles of the doctrine in question teach this idea. For to have an Eternal Son we must have a second person in the Godhead, and to have a second person in the Godhead is to have an Eternal Son. Hence the one is the other, and they stand or fall together. Besides the Patriarchs and Apostles, never taught us to conceive of God as being divided into separate subsistencies; and if there is no other way to prove the doctrine than its defenders have exhibited, they explode the doctrine with their own pen. This we shall show in its proper place; meantime we call on the inspired writers for their testimony. We call on Moses, God's Secretary, for witness in this matter, whose writings we all have recourse to. So far from leading us to conceive of the Godhead being divided, he preases the opposite idea with uniform care. Hear O Israel! The Lord our God is one Lord: Deut. 6, 4. Exod. 20, 3. Deut. 4, 35, 39. Deut. 5, 7. Deut. 32, 39. We now call on Isaiah, another of Heaven's available library: Isaiah 43, 10 11, and 44, 6, and 45 5. We also call on Zechariah, as another of Heaven's penmen: 14, 9. In that day shall there be *one* Lord, and his name *one*, (not three.) New Testament writers, Matt. 19, 17, Mark 12, 29, John 17, 3, 1 Cor. 8, 4, Gal. 3, 20, 1 Tim. 2, 5, Rom. 3, 30, Rom. 10, 12, Jude 25, &c., &c.

We further observe that Treffry is supernaturally constrained to denounce the practice of dividing God doctrinally, which was a common thing done by false teachers in St. John's day, against which heresy St. John wrote, according to Treffry. On page 227, he says: The apostle John wrote as a provision against the *blasphemous* dogma of those who, as far as it was in their power, would *divide the Lord*—hence we perceive with what propriety St. John affirms Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and also where he carefully concentrates in his one person the several titles by which our Redeemer is distinguished;" and still the foul heresy is entertained by Treffry and his pupils, as a virtual denial of the unity of God, notwithstanding God denounces the practice by St. John according to Treffry.

Now the doctrine in question is supposed to be of vital importance, and it is by many thought to be *doing violence to truth and righteousness to suspect its truthfulness*. All men will agree with me in this, that it is either true or false. If 999 in every 1000 take the wrong side they cannot make it right. Now we call on those who take the platform in its defence; to join us in examining the origin of personality in the God-head, according to their own mode of explaining it, which to us appears a mere traditional whim, to which there is no credit due.

CHAPTER IX.

THE ORIGIN OF PERSONALITY IN THE GOD-HEAD BY ITS DEFENDERS.

We take the position that the doctrine in question is not a Bible doctrine, and if its defenders have no other way of proving it, than those they have resorted to, they explode the doctrine with their own pen. We point this out to the unprejudiced Bible student by referring to and examining their own mode of explaining it. It is well known that the doctrine in question was disputed from the first age of Christianity, and it is reasonable to admit that its modern defenders who are approved of as such, are quite capable of stating its principles as they believe them; and we are warrantable in concluding that they mean what they say. We take Bishop Pearson, late Lord Bishop of Chester, the Rev. Richard Watson, and the Rev. Richard Treffry, as acknowledged standards in its defence, who all agree in this point, that there was but one person originally in the Eternal God-head, called the Father. Pearson says in his exposition of the Creed, page 204, "wherefore it necessarily follows that Jesus Christ who is certainly not the Father, cannot be a person subsisting in the divine nature originally of himself." On the next page he says, "and being the Divine nature as it is absolutely immaterial and incorporeal, is also indivisible, Christ cannot have any part of it only communicated to him; but the whole." This is as true as the Bible: had he applied this idea to the Virgin's Son, he would have given Christ proper divinity, even all the fulness of the God-head bodily, which the doctrine in question denies him. On page 203, he says, "The Divine essence which Christ had, he had not of himself, but by communication of the Father," this also is true. Had he looked for this Christ in the Virgin's Son, and not in past eternity, he was all right. At this point tradition led him astray into past eternity, to divide the God-head, which St. John denounces, according to Treffry, "Rev. Richard Watson quotes Bishop Pearson and Bishop Bull, who all agree in the opinion that though God the Father is the fountain of the Deity, the whole of the Divine Nature, or undivided Divine essence is communicated from the Father to the Son," *Ins. Vol. 1, page 451*, here is the same idea prostituted by harkening to unscriptural tradition, which leads into past eternity, to divide the God-head by originating persons therein, by human conjecture, and saying "Lo here is Christ." Jesus saith, "believe them not."

Let us now examine the above teachings. Pearson says: It necessarily follows that Jesus Christ who is certainly not the Father, cannot be a person subsisting in the Divine nature originally of himself—but being that the Divine nature as it is absolutely immaterial, and incorporeal, is also indivisible, Christ cannot have any part of it only communicated to him, but the whole." This is as true as the Bible, and all scripture agrees in applying this idea to the Virgin's Son, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head bodily.

— Now here is an acknowledgment of the unity of God, which

accords with scripture and right reason, and a virtual denial of personality existing originally in the God-head. The whole tenor of scripture accords with this principle. God is justified in presence of the Children of light, in giving the above mentioned theologians light on this point. Their hand writing is witness to this in the Church militant. Now the above idea is perfectly applicable to the term Son of God, as originating in the act of the incarnation in the complex character of Christ in the Virgin's womb.

Now the question is this, how did the above theologians, with their abettors, who agree with them in the indivisible unity of the Divine essence, turn about and embrace implicitly what Treffry calls on page 227 of his book "a blasphemous dogma of those who as far as it was in their power, would divide the Lord"? Now, how is it, that men of piety and learning, with an open Bible in their hand, will receive and vindicate the principles which Treffry (truly) calls "blasphemous," and who is it could not agree with him in this? The absurdity herein discoverable is more extensively seen in the fact, that the history of man in all ages of the world, practically carried out by him, shows to the enlightened observer an inclination to multiply gods. Tradition is the source whence the rising posterity obtains the inducement that leads into this error. It teaches in the doctrine in question that there is greater and lesser in infinity, and that there is an inferior God-head, which the venerable John Wesley said before he died "shocks our senses." Such is the God exhibited to us in the doctrine in question. These are not the characteristics of the God of the Bible: Witness Isaiah 43, 10, 11; Zech. 14 9; 1st Cor., 8 4, 6; Eph. 4, 5, 6; 1st Tim. 2, 5. A professed Christian with an open Bible in hand looking to tradition for characteristics of the God of the Universe, and receiving the above principles, debases himself lower than the Heathen who has not the Bible. The God of the Bible is one God; no other God with him, Isaiah 43, 10 and 44-8, and 45, 5-6; Zach. 14:9; 1st Cor. 8, 4-6; Mala. 2-10; Ephe. 4, 5, 6; 1st Cor. 12-11; 1st Tim. 2-5; Deut. 6-4. The idea given to us of God by the doctrine in question outstrips in absurdity that of Heathens in general. They have their lords many and Gods many, but we are not aware that they have yet conceived the idea of dividing any of their Gods into three, or transmitting three into one. This the doctrine in question attempts to do in reference to the God of the Bible. Is it not to be believed that it is the mystery of iniquity that still works, found in the principles of the doctrine in question, which is framed by human conjecture and pressed on us by tradition, with all its characteristic, inherent, irreconcilable discrepancies?

Now, it is to be seen by the enlightened observer where the above-mentioned pious theologians are led astray by tradition into past and unrevealed eternity, looking for the son of God, that they have no guide but human imagination as suggested by others and exercised by themselves. They have no scriptural guidance into past eternity to examine the eternal God-head for the origin of an eternal

Son. Here is where tradition bewitches the pious Christian to go looking for the Son of God into past eternity. The Holy Bible don't multiply gods, nor divide gods, nor generate gods, nor annihilate gods, and supply their place, like the doctrine in question attempts to do.

God has convinced them, as far as scripture teachings can go, in their case or any other man's case. Their own writings prove this. They are convinced there is but one Divine Essence, and that this is indivisible—cannot be denied. This is as true as the Bible. And they are convinced that Christ Jesus or Son of God “could not have been a person existing in the God-head originally of himself.” This also is as true as the Bible; “and that Christ cannot receive a part only of the Divine Essence but the whole.” This is also supported by the scriptures; this is proper divinity given to Christ. These convictions were fastened in their judgment by the spirit of God. While they abide by scripture in the use of right reason they are truthful. These convictions thus expressed in their own handwriting amount to a perfect denial of personality existing originally in the God-head. Thus far they have the whole Bible in their favor. Now when the doctrine in question was presented to them, had they examined it by the above scriptural principles, they would have rejected it at once; and even now any honest Bible Student examining the principles of the doctrine in question with the above principles, carefully and prayerfully, will be constrained to give it up as a dangerous heresy.

Tradition, with the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship came to these pious theologians, whose minds were scripturally right in reference to God and the Son of God as above pointed out, and they incautiously received, with implicit credence, the doctrine in question, as it was handed to them; and in their simplicity entered into an explanatory defence of the doctrine, and so far are bidding God-speed to anti-christian heresy.

CHAPTER X.

AN EXPLORING TOUR INTO PAST ETERNITY.

Now we will submit to go with these theological explorers in their imaginary search of an eternal Son, and three persons in the God-head, two of which are to be originated by human imagination—one by generation, and the other by production in some other way, and see whether their conclusion relative to their having found them is not the result of judicial blindness. Pearson takes the lead. We will follow him and his pupils and try to show them where they err, not knowing the scriptures nor the power of God. He (Pearson) now sets to work to find in the God-head three distinct persons, same in substance, equal in power and glory, and his colleagues look on and agree, and shocking to behold, the plan he takes leaves us no God, when logically examined in the use of right reason. He tells us as above referred to, “There is but one Divine Essence,” and this cannot be divided; and on page 203, exposition of the creed, “The Divine Essence

which Christ had, he had not of himself, but by communication of the Father." Watson agrees with this in his *Institutes*, page 474-5. He tells us in reference to the origination of personality in the God-head, without any authority from the scriptures, "There is a communication without any deprivation or deminution in the communicant, an eternal generation and an eternal procession—without precedence or succession—without proper causality or dependence—a Father imparting his own and a son receiving his father's life, and a spirit issuing from both;" and on page 630 he says, "The Father communicateth the God-head to the son and both to the spirit;" and Treffry, page 390. The Father as God begets, the Son as God is begotten, the Holy Ghost as God proceeds;" all this without being able to say in one instance, "thus saith the Lord." Now it is admitted by all, that there was but one person originally in the God-head, even the Father; but these expounders of the traditional doctrine in question say, as if they had attended the generating and birth chamber of the imaginary eternal Son, that the Father begat, by a process of generation, His own eternal Son in the God-head (I would ask who told you?) and communicated to him the whole of the undivided Divine Essence. The Father communicateth the whole of the God-head to the Son. If you had said to the Virgin's Son in the act of incarnation in the womb, you would have scripture to support you. Now a third person is wanting yet, and to originate him they say, "that the Father and the Son produced the Holy Spirit." This is originating the Holy Spirit. Is not the Lord that Spirit? God is a spirit. Are there two Divine Spirits? Would not this be God making God? Facts are against you. Is not one God enough? Read Isaiah 43, 10-11. This is also a denial of personality existing originally in the God-head. Now let us examine the above conjectures, and we shall see that God's spirit never suggested them.

I ask these explorers where have you located the Father—the original and only person in the God-head—since you have taken from him the whole of the undivided Divine Essence, and given it to an originated Son. What kind of a being is he? or where does he live? He once had the whole of the Divine essence; now he has none of it. There can be but one being in the world possessed of the undivided Divine Essence. I say where have you located the original person. "Some have not the knowledge of God. I speak this to your shame."

But this is not all, for at this point in their theory they are obliged to wrench the whole of the undivided Divine Essence, not only from the Father, but from the imaginary eternal Son, and give it to the imaginary originated Holy Spirit, in order to have three persons. Now I ask these theologians what kind of a wilderness or forbidden ground have you been led into by tradition? You are now in your exploring tour, where you are in darkness. God's word has not been a light to your feet nor a lamp to your path. You are where God's word never guided you. You cannot presume to say thus saith the Lord, in your attempt

to multiply subsistences in the God-head. You don't know where you are. You have now found out a region in your travels with tradition where there is no God. You have annihilated God virtually in your own imagination, in your attempt to originate personality in the God-head, for the acknowledged original person in the God-head, even the Father, you have dethroned him in your own imagination by taking from him the whole of the God-head, even the only and undivided Divine Essence, and giving it to an imaginary generated production. A God that divests himself of the whole of the undivided Divine Essence, ceases to be God, and an originated being of whatever order, to whom is communicated the whole of the divine nature, he is not God; he has not the attributes of eternity, self-existence and independence, which is indispensibly needful to the God of the Universe. You have taken away my Lord; I know not where you have laid him."

You have also taken the whole of the undivided Divine Essence from the imaginary eternal Son, and given it to the imaginary originated Holy Spirit. Here you have originated the Holy Spirit in your imagination. You have got into big business. Is any credit due to you? If your neighbor should tell you he was finding out Gods—one mocking another—would you call him a mad man? And worse still on your part; for with all the helps tradition gives you, of 18 hundred years experience, you have not fixed it yet; for you have yet but one person in the God-head possessed with the undivided Divine Essence. Your own theory, the way you give it, destroys personality in the God-head. In the act of building your fabric of personality you pull it down with your own hands, on the ground that it never existed, and you cannot fix it; and the dupes of tradition have been at it generation after generation and it is not fixed yet. You cannot annihilate God and supply his place; you may be the means of cheating the unwary on this subject, and put your finger in your own eye, and live and die in darkness with an open Bible in your hand, while you look away to tradition in preference to the Bible for the knowledge of the true God.

And this is not the worst of it; for by your mode of explanatory defence, while ingeniously trying to divide or multiply the God-head, you say the Father is not the Divine Essence, for the Father communicated it to the Son, hence the Father and the Divine Essence are two. And it involves the same difficulty in reference to the Son; for the eternal Son is not the Divine Essence, because the Divine Essence was communicated to the Son. And you have the same difficulty in reference to the Holy Spirit, for the Holy Spirit is not the Divine Essence, because the Divine Essence was communicated to the Holy Spirit. Hence your mode of originating personality destroys the doctrine of the Trinity; for you have four subsistences instead of three—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the Divine Essence. The doctrine destroys itself, when looked at as its defenders explain it. It gives us but one person in the God-head possessed of the undivided

ed Divine Essence, and it gives us also four subsistences in the God-head,—the Father, Son, Holy Spirit and Divine Essence. So in these two essential views that its expounders give of the origination of personality in the God-head, they destroy its truthfulness, root and branch ; its principles destroy itself. Traditional fallacy cannot supersede God's word, short of showing its cloven foot to the scripturally guided in the use of right reason.

Now, this is the doctrine of personality and eternal Sonship in the God-head, according to its most approved expounders, who have taken the platform in its defence. Hence is it not a fair deduction from the above considerations, that they who admit scripturally that there is but one God, must reject the doctrine in question, and admit that we have yet but one subsistence in the God-head? as it was originally indisputably so, as acknowledged by the above mentioned theologians, who drift into the most papable absurdities when attempting to point out the origin of personality in the God-head. I would therefore ask the impartial Bible Student whether the above system of human surmisings does not hold out an inducement to the redeemed community to worship they know not what—(an eternal Son)—a name that inspiration never spoke or wrote? Is he not presented as a rival to the Virgin's Son, the true Son of God, who had no human Father? God was his Father. He is the only name given under Heaven, amongst men, by which we must be saved. Jesus Christ of Nazareth who was crucified, whom God raised from the dead. Neither is there salvation in any other name, Acts 4-10, 12. Apply the name Son of God as originating in and belonging to the complex-character of Jesus Christ, and we then have no difficulty. Nor do we want a lesson from tradition to make the subject as plain as God designs it to be ; for the New Testament describes it as clear as a sunbeam.

Again, in the use of right reason the absurdity increases still, in irreconcilable discrepancy ; for the doctrine in question, as above described, virtually leaves us no God. As before noticed, a God who communicates the whole of the Divine nature or Essence to another, logically ceases to be God ; and a creature of whatsoever order, to whom is communicated the whole of the Divine Essence, is no God, for such has not the attributes of eternity, self-existence, independence, &c., &c., which is indispensably needful to the God of the universe. Therefore, in common sense, reason and scripture, the doctrine in question leaves us no God ; its defenders being judges. So in attempting to build a fabric of personality, and eternal Sonship in the God-head, they pull it down in the judgment of the man who searches for the true characteristics of God in the Bible, and not in traditional fallacy, and this doctrine thus described by its expounders supplies the principle which actuates the fool who says in his heart, "There is no God."

The doctrine involves another impossibility, that is, that God could communicate the whole of His divine nature to another ; but, to speak with reverence, God could not make another God, or communicate His incommunicable attributes to another. Does

it not outrage scripture and common sense, to teach what involves the absurdity, that God could and did communicate his attributes of Eternity, immutability, omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence, self-existence, and independence, &c., &c., to an originated production of his own? Does it not appear as the wonder of wonders, that the human mind could conceive without the least scripture guidance thereto of an imaginary eternal Son? —that a necessity existed on any grounds for the conception or admission of such a fabulous scheme, which tends to libel the God of the Universe as being untruthful, (Isaiah 43, 10-11,) and turn the mind of the unwary away from contemplating the true Son of God, the object of faith and eternal salvation, “to whom all the Prophets gave witness that through His name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.” I think surely the Apostle had reference to the principles of this doctrine, when he said, the mystery of iniquity doth already work. This is the doctrine I think he had special reference to, and if so, every branch of the nominal Church of Christ which holds the doctrine in question is chargeable with holding anti-christian heresy. They now exonerate themselves by the one charging it on the other in a sectarian point of view, and thereby ease their own minds; and they who are more orthodox in their own view, on the ground that there are more conversions to God effected through their sectarian instrumentality, and make this the basis from which they conclude that their doctrines are all true, have need to compare the principles of this doctrine with the word of God.

It has been said as a recommendation to the doctrine in question, that almost all the good that has been done in the world has been done by men that held this doctrine. To this we agree; then why ought their doctrines as a whole to be considered truthful? There is suggested one reason by St. Paul, that is, they build on Christ as the only foundation, not only with doctrines comparable to gold, silver, precious stone, but also with doctrines comparable to wood, hay, stubble. The same ministerial builder may use both materials. The gold, silver, and precious stones are materials that will stand the fire of God's truth, but all the labor spent in building with wood, hay and stubble is labor lost, not as much reward for it as a cup of cold water.

And how does the ministerial builder keep these materials apart when he is positively using both when building on Christ? We consider in the following way: God has in the depth of his mercy and wisdom struck out the dividing line in what the Scriptures call “the fulness of time.” When the period arrived when the promise of a coming Saviour was to be fulfilled, God sent forth his son made of a woman. This is proper humanity. He took not on himself the nature of angels, but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. (He) who is He? all the fullness of the God-head bodily, Col. 2-9. (This is proper Divinity.)

Now, the gold, silver and precious stones, or doctrines compared to these materials, all apply to and belong to the New

x not.

Testament description of Jesus Christ, commencing at the incarnation, and all wood, hay and stubble (or doctrines compared to these materials) all apply and belong to the traditional description the doctrine in question gives of the pre-existent divine nature of Christ. It solely points to that God who took not on him the nature of angels, but who took on him the seed of Abraham, which the Apostle describes as all the fulness of the God-head bodily, and the burthen of the doctrine concentrates in one point, and that is, to deny proper divinity to our Lord Jesus Christ. It gives him but the one-third of the God-head as the conjectural result of imaginary personality in the God-head ; this doctrine we call wood, hay and stubble, and we think it never converted a soul yet, and never will, for God's Spirit cannot use falsehood to convert or sanctify the redeemed race.

Whereas, the converting power that attends the minister's labours is attributable to his faithfully holding forth the New Testament description of Christ. With what salutary pleasure we listen to him when he manifestly forgets the wood, hay and stubble, and gives us the golden truths found in the New Testament description of Christ. That God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, yet all the fulness of the God-head bodily (for it takes all the fulness of the God-head bodily to possess Christ Jesus with proper Divinity.) This is what the doctrine in question don't give Him, it gives Him but one imaginary subsistence out of three, and that "Jesus Christ by the grace of God tasted death for every man." "He was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification," and by Him, whosoever believeth in Him are justified from all things, from which it was impossible to be justified by the law of Moses." "He died, the just for the unjust, to bring us to God." "He is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth," "and to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted to him for righteousness," and "he is the author of eternal salvation to them that obey him," "and be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." Father, I will that where I am there shall my servants be also to behold my glory." "It doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is," "and so shall we be ever with the Lord," "and blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed," "and what we know not now in reference to these things, we shall know hereafter." The minister who preaches these and such like golden truths faithfully "shall save himself and them that hear him." I might enumerate, but my reader has an open Bible and God's authority and guidance, to gather up the golden truths in a right use of which God conveys the converting sanctifying power into them that believe ; "sanctify them through Thy truth, Thy word is truth." God cannot sanctify by falsehood ; false doctrines of whatsoever import may be called "doctrines of devils," "of vanities," "of men ;" "in vain do they worship me, teaching for

doctrines the commandments of men." It is in the use of these materials, the ministerial builder is instrumental in converting sinners, not by using wood, hay, stubble ; all such materials used in God's building are to be burned up and the builder suffer loss, who uses such materials ; and if the simple hearer be led to trust in a redeeming sacrifice that never had an existence as such, what will be the consequence in their case ? If lost by unscriptural teachings, are these ministers skirts clear ? Oh ministers ! take example by Christ, (John 12, 49-50,--John 17, 8.) The doctrine in question does not speak according to this rule.

The New Testament teaching in reference to the blessed Jesus is calculated and designed to meet the lowest capacity of the accountable individual, and they that believe are saved by grace through faith. Now, it is in the reception and right use of these New Testament doctrines, comparable to gold, silver and precious stones, that the redeemed community are saved ; it is rejection or abuse of them by which any are lost, for all have redemption in his blood ; the forgiveness of sins, provided and offered to them.

The doctrine in question, in its bones and sinews, in its inherent principles, in its origin and perpetuation, is inflammable, combustible, in the presence of inspired truth, as it is observable that the doctrine points solely to the pre-existent divine nature of Christ, and every principle it contains goes to deny him proper divinity, it takes hold of the God-head in the absence of all scripture guidance, and it libels, and dissects the God-head into parts, and its principles give but a partial share of the imaginary divisions of the God-head to Christ, which division, logically examined, has not attributes of eternity, self-existence or independence in it ; hence it is no divinity all ; and the doctrinal teachers say this is the second person originated by generation in the God-head, that left the bosom of his father and came down to this world to die, to redeem. This is the dangerous heresy.

Now, stretch this partial divinity, which this doctrine gives to Christ, or wood, hay, stubble, combustible, in the presence of the Judgment Seat, along side of the golden truth,—in Him (Christ) dwelleth all the fullness of the God-head bodily—and will not the fire of God in His truth consume the inflammable combustible, that is by tradition only working as the mystery of iniquity so deceiving to the unwary. What do ministerial builders expect to gain by using this combustible, or what could they lose in their own view of it in giving it up ? The doctrine that necessitates them to deny proper divinity to our Lord Jesus Christ, and build solely in future with gold, silver and precious stone, which is found in the New Testament quarry, as contained in these blessed truths, God was in Christ. There is but one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus, "in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the God-head bodily." This is proper divinity ; the doctrine in question denies Christ this.

We give it as our opinion that this is ~~the~~ reason, and perhaps the chief reason why so many religious services are com-

parable to busy idleness, and that the converting power is almost lost, compared with the Apostolic day and Apostolic labours. It was not classical education, nor the power of rhetoric, but it was the unction that accompanied unadulterated divine truth, in which consisted the converting power. What the Apostles preached was *all truth*; the Apostles, writings as consistently compare with each other as the links of a chain. The enlightened observer does see where revivals of religion take place, that it is not by denying proper Divinity to Christ, but by giving him all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, not partially, as the doctrine in question does.

Now, as I have before intimated, if there is no other way to prove the doctrine in question, than what these modern defenders have exhibited, the doctrine is exploded with their own pen, and it appears that God has so ordained it that all who ever yet wrote in its defence manifestly exhibited their own folly in their irreconcilable discrepancies—themselves being judges.

The error the Jews fell into relative to their sacrifices, in Matt. 23, 16-19, so reprov'd and denounced by the Saviour, is equally chargeable against the adherents to this doctrine, relative to the views they take of the sacrifice by which God redeemed the world; they both fell into the same error. In the above portion of scripture it is manifest the Jews believed their sacrifices or gifts which they offered as a type of the Lamb of God by whom God was to redeem the world, had in themselves inherent worth or natural intrinsic value, independent of obtaining it from the altar on which it was laid as a gift or offering. The Saviour reproves this error, charging them that were taken in it as blind fools. "Woe unto you ye blind guides which say, whosoever shall swear by the Temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the Temple, he is a debtor. Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater the gold or the Temple that sanctifieth the gold; and whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing: but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty. Ye fools and blind! for whether is greater the gift or the altar that sanctifieth the gift." The gift though it was gold had no worth in it till it obtained it out of the altar on which it was laid. This typifies the complex character of Christ, and shows us where the blood of the man Christ obtained its merit. Christ was sacrificed for us on the altar of proper Divinity, this is where the blood of Christ obtains its merit, and becomes the song of the redeemed, unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, &c. Now the doctrine in question points to a Divine sacrifice which has in itself infinite merit, independent of obtaining it from its being laid on any altar, hence it is put into our mouths in devotional song, "God for a guilty world has died." "The great Creator died." "The God of Angels died." We are sure the Bible does not say so. This is precisely the error of the Jews relative to their sacrifice, for which the Saviour called them blind fools.

The reproof thus given to the Jews is designed to teach them

how they should think of their sacrifices and offerings, even that they derived their principle of acceptance out of the altar on which they were laid. This instructive reproof is perfectly applicable to the adherents to the doctrine in question. "Christ our passover was sanctified for us"; (1 Cor. 5, 7,) even proper humanity (Gal. 3, 16) which received its redeeming merit out of the Divine nature with which humanity in Christ was united. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham. (Heb. 2. 16.) It is observable in the case of the Jews, that their sacrifice was not their altar, nor was their altar their sacrifice. Equally so, in reference to Christ our atoning sacrifice. He was not the altar; the Divine nature was the altar on which he was laid as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, nor was the Divine nature the sacrifice; it could not be the sacrifice by which the world was redeemed. The Jewish altar prefigured the Divine nature as the altar that gave merit to the man Christ, bleeding and dying as the redemption price exacted and paid. Hence it is absurd to teach that it was a Divine sacrifice God required, and in supplying it God himself died; this is equal to saying that the altar was the sacrifice, which is absurd. This is the error the doctrine in question snares its adherents into, and the entertainers of the doctrine in question are as worthy the appellation of fools and blind as to the views they take of the sacrifice by which God redeemed the world, as were the Jews in reference to the view they took of their offerings; both are found in the same error and are worthy of the same reproof.

The adherents of this doctrine see clearly they cannot have an Eternal Son short of having personality in the Godhead, and they cannot have personality in the Godhead short of having an Eternal Son; hence the one doctrine is dependent on, and arises out of the other, so it is clearly seen these two doctrines stand or fall together, as Telfry plainly taught on page 20 of his book. The principles on which it is based sap its foundation; look at it from whatsoever scriptural standpoint you will, it carries self refutation on the face of it, in view of those who are not governed by prejudice, but are guided by God's word in the use of right reason.

CHAPTER XI.

A SUGGESTION GIVEN, AND EGOTISM AND SLANDER EXPOSED.

Now is it to be expected that the entertainers of the doctrine in question will attempt any new mode of proving its truthfulness? I would suggest to them to not do as the above theologians have done, in their going to old Jewish and Heathen historians as their authority for sentiment and phraseology, but go to school to your Bible in the use of right reason, and see if in the search of an eternal son, you enter into those holy ranks of inspired writers, they will not say unto you in reference to your past conduct, "O foolish man! who hath bewitched you," to go to past eternity looking for the Son of God," before whose eyes (in the holy scriptures) Jesus Christ has been evidently set forth crucified among

you." "Therefore be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by Him is this man made whole; neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name given under Heaven amongst men by which we must be saved." So it is worse than vain to bring a name that Inspiration never spoke nor wrote, and present Him as a rival to the above name "who was *crucified*, whom God raised from the dead," "who now appears in the presence of God for us."

His egotism. On page 13, of his preface, "he says, he never willingly perverted the sense of an antagonist—he never intentionally used an irritating mode of speech, he has never given to citation any meaning which the strictest impartiality did not seem to warrant, or used expressions which, supposing them appropriate, he is not willing to have retorted upon himself." Let us see whether this is true. It appears he has forgotten himself, by what we see on page fifty one. He there libels his opponents with unjustifiable misrepresentation; he says—"the term Son of God—were it blotted out of the New Testament, far from leaving any blank in their system, one can hardly suppose but that they would rejoice at getting rid of the phrase so indefinite and vexatious."

If this is not misrepresentation, I don't know what could be. We who reject the doctrine in question, reject it as a dangerous heresy, but we glory in the term Son of God, being so frequently mentioned in the inspired word, and that in no single instance inside the Bible, is the term eternal attached to it. The term Son is not blotted out of the Bible, God has preserved the precious name uncontaminated inside the New Testament, and till the last trumpet sounds, it will remain the same; and though other books may contain the term Eternal Son in them, it never was, nor ever will be found inside the Bible; thank God for the truth, and a disposition to receive it in the love thereof.

On page 25, he says, in vindication of the inspired writers, "That they should get credit for an equal degree of precision and correctness with authors in general." Yes, we should admit that they mean what they say, and to make their word convey a different meaning to what they intended, is a daring absurdity, and denial of precision and correctness to the inspired writers. This is done by adding the term Eternal, to the term *Son of God*. It changes His origin, locality, and nature; so we say to Treffry and his followers, Physicians heal yourselves.

Page 130, in note there which he quotes from Sherlock, and by so doing he admits it as truth, "He charges Dr. Adam Clark, with a denial of the union of human and Divine natures in the Son of God." Misrepresentation in some instances is as bad as murder, when it leads to it, either of person or character, whereas the impartial reader can easily ascertain that the Son of God which he speaks of never was other than possessed of two natures, human and Divine, united in the act of the incarnation in the Virgin's womb.

Not so in reference to the imaginary Eternal Son; he had not

two natures, for the doctrine in question gives him no proper nature at all, neither human nor Divine ; it necessitates its adherents to this, and whoever entertains the doctrine in question is obliged thereby to deny proper Divinity to our Lord Jesus Christ, in the very act of admitting personality in the Godhead ; the doctrine gives him but one subsistence out of three as his Divine nature ; this is not proper, but partial Divinity. St. Paul gives him all the fulness of the Godhead ; tradition denies him this ; no man can consistently give Christ proper Divinity and entertain the doctrine in question.

This doctrine is doing in this what it intended to do, denying proper Divinity to Christ. This Dr. Clark did not do. Nor does the doctrine give the Son of God proper humanity, for it says the Son of God was originated in the Godhead before time or flesh ; this is the mark given by St. John in his second Epistle to the anti-christian teacher whom St. John calls a transgressor ; he confesses not that Jesus Christ came in the flesh ; the Eternal Son came not in the flesh ; the doctrine says he came before time or flesh, even in past eternity ; hence he is said to be a Son before there was human flesh. This is not the Son of God St. Paul points to when he says, " in the fulness of time God sent forth his Son made of a woman " ; hence the Eternal Son has no proper nature, neither human nor Divine. This is not the Son of God Dr. Clark believed in.

It is evident that Treffry or his ancestral talebearers, who brought to him the traditional vanities contained in the doctrine in question, was not actuated by the same spirit as St. John and St. Paul. John was in the Isle of Patmos, and was in the spirit, and saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it ; but though he describes the glorified humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ, he does not presume to describe him that sat on the Great White Throne. Paul was caught up in the visions of God into the third Heaven, was an eye and ear witness of the language and melodies of the spirit world ; yet when he returned, was not permitted to relate to mortals what he was a living witness of ; the laws, language and employments of the spirit world, and the scenes above that of earth must not be taught or related on earth by human voice to human ears.

But our author as an acknowledged incapacitated mortal, will link arms with Heathens, who have not the Bible, and will attempt to tell us imaginary wonders about the ineffable Jehovah, which the scriptures teach nothing of. He tries to tell us who it is that sitteth on the great white throne, whom St. John durst not attempt to describe, and that Treffry acknowledges no creature has the faculty to scrutinize, yet he ventures to fill up the blank in our theological literature, in asserting that he is a being who exists in three subsistences, each of which is possessed of sexual propagating qualities, and ingeniously suggests the idea that a productive intercourse was practically carried out, analagous to human propagation, and the result was an Eternal Son produced. Will not the Bible student admit that a higher species of vanity can not be

imagined. He does not stop here ; on page 169 he says, " Beyond controversy there is nothing in the Gospel records which specifically affirms the identity in our Lord of the characters of the Christ and the Son of God." Is it possible he did not see this in the Gospel records ? I shall point his readers to where it is inserted,—Matt. 16, 16, "and Simon Peter answered and said, thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." And also John 20, 31 ; " But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God," (not the dead God), "and that believing ye might have life through his name." And in Acts 8, 37, "and Philip said, if thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest, and he answered and said I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." And Philip baptised the eunuch in this faith. The man that overlooks the existence of such scriptures is not a safe guide.

No It is not likely he saw that if the identity of Christ and Son of God was applied specially to our blessed Lord, it would destroy his system of eternal sonship, for it would make the term son originate in the incarnation, and belong to the complex character of Christ, which he labours to deny.

As a further repetition of the above absurdity, he finds it necessary on page 177 to brand the teaching of the Holy Ghost as absolute nonsense, in the following words :—" The addition of the title to that of Christ, in all the foregoing cases is a mere redundancy, and one which far from aiding actually obscures the sense. Some of these passages, indeed, this exposition reduces to *absolute nonsense*." Such arrogance against God is not found in the highway of holiness ; such scepticism does not point or lead in the way to Heaven.

He further says on page 178, " Assuming that these appellations, Christ and Son of God, were commonly regarded as descriptive of two distinct persons." This is another false proposition, and is consequently calculated to lead to false conclusions. But let us be divinely guided to assume truthfully, that these appellations, Christ and Son of God, were descriptive of one person possessed of two natures, human and divine, and then we have their true meaning.

On page 8, he says, " It would be a melancholy consideration, that in this present *era* of extensive enquiry, and with all the aids which the research and wisdom of ages can supply, we should yet, upon this point, be generally in error."

Its adherents and defenders must remain in error on this subject, till they go to the judgment seat of Christ ; if instead of examining they employ their energies in defending, and handing down to posterity the traditional error, and will prefer Heathen and Jewish phraseology and sentiments, to the teachings of the Holy Bible,

CHAPTER XII.

BEHOLD THE SOURCE WHENCE TREFFRY OBTAINED HIS MOST VALUABLE AIDS.

We have so far selected a few of many of the same import, of the absurdities to be found in Treffry's book; in his acknowledged incapacities to understand or explain the doctrine in question, and his acting contrary to his convictions. We shall now examine the source whence he received this doctrine of a generated Deity, and his pupils may ask themselves the same question, while we invite them to further continue with us till they hear his acknowledgements. He says on page 238 of his book:—"The source whence the *corrupt doctrine of a divine generation* found its way into the Church of Christ, was even in St. John's day—(though he does not appear himself to perceive that he has embraced the foul heresy) the doctrine of a divine generation, was extensively received, it was common at once to the theology of the Jews, or the orientalized philosophy of the Greek, and so strong had it laid hold upon the faith of men as eventually to be extended to all intelligent existences. It was this tenet in an exaggerated and distorted form, which systematized the *most pernicious heresies in the Primitive Church*. Numerous deons or emanations being fancied or feigned possessing a divine geniture, and a certain sort of consubstantiality. This term means an existence of more than one in the same subsistence. This figment in all probability had begun to develope itself during the lifetime of St. John, and in the following century, as taught by Valentinus and others of less note, assumed prominent position among dogmas of the day." What shall we think of a Christian theologian whose eyes confessedly were open to see this corrupt figment so pernicious in its result, and who tells us it was this tenet which systematized the most pernicious heresies in the Primitive Church, and with his eyes open thus, takes hold of it as if it was revealed from Heaven, and labours to establish it as truth? Does he not appear to act as if determined to believe falsehood himself, and takes pleasure in them that do the same? Can such a man be a safe guide on the point in which he thus errs? Could he vindicate such corrupt figments for any other reason than to receive glory from his Ministerial associates, who had taken the platform in its defence? For God could not give glory and approbation to such conduct. How applicable that scripture is, "They have their reward." See how many glory in Treffry as proper authority! The bible does not appear to have been his reference book on this subject; the phraseology to suit him is not inside the Bible; he gets it with Heathens and ancient Jews. He grapples at Jewish and Heathen phraseology, and the selection he makes is very objectionable; he goes to a man who lived probably in the age of St. John; even Philo, a Jewish historian, for Jewish phraseology. We think that a Christian theologian in the 19th century should rather look to a converted Jew as was St Paul, for evangelical

phraseology, than look to the man who was probably a party in plotting the crucifixion and death of the true Son of God.

On page 57, he says, "Indeed the only sources of information of this class that are not liable to serious objection, are the writings of the Aypocrypha, the Targum of *Ankelos*, and the works of Philo Judæus; yet they are interesting and instructive, as supplying the germs of certain opinions and modes of expressions, which in a subsequent age became prominent and remarkable." Here is where he got his germs and opinions, and not in the Bible. On page 59, he says, "But the writings of Philo belong to the precise period respecting which we enquire, and upon the points they treat, are usually sufficiently voluminous, in addition to which their genuineness is not suspected. They are, therefore, in many respects the most valuable aids to the present part of our investigation which we can command."

Now, let us see the character Treffry gives of Philo, as an unreliable author, and we shall see that the source from whence he gleans, is as unreliable as his own capabilities are, he having not the faculty to examine the subject according to his own conviction, as above noticed. On page 76, behold the character he gives of Philo, whom he chooses in preference to St. Paul, in phraseology, for his example:—"No ancient writings with which I am acquainted so frequently disappoint a Christian reader as do those of Philo. There is often in them a gleam of truth so bright as to lead to the expectation of some developement of doctrine purely evangelical; but scarcely has the hope been framed, when a cloud of philosophic dreaming intervenes, and all is dark again. Hence there is scarcely any author of whom a less correct idea is to be framed from detached expressions or isolated phrases." For example:—The Christian reader, upon being told that he represents God as a great shepherd, who appoints the Son to the care of his sacred flock, at once recurs to the inimitable discourse of our Lord as recorded by St. John, chapter ten, and to its assemblage of affecting images; but all this agreeable emotion subsides, upon the introduction of the cold and repulsive fancy that the object of the divine pastoral care is not the Church of the blood redeemed, but merely the elements and the planetary system. This is the man Treffry derives his most valuable aids from respecting his present investigation, and uses him in preference to St. Paul or St. John, who lived probably in the same age with each other; but the germs of phrases used in Philo's day, that became so conspicuous in Treffry's day, the Apostles knew nothing about; such as eternal Son or divine generation. Treffry had to go outside the Bible for examples relative to these things.

On page 77, he says, "No one could peruse the works of these Fathers (element and origin) even in the most cursory way, without recognizing them as the production of men who believed in Jesus, and in the great truths delivered by His Spirit. But nothing can be more remote from the genius of the writings of Philo; he has no reference to the Messiah, no indications that in

any sense he waited for the consolation of Israel. Large portions of his works might be transferred to the pages of a heathen philosopher, without any perceptible incongruity, and his allegorical exposition of pentateuch usually terminates either in the sensible universe, or in abstracts on the Divine Essence and government. On page 78 he says, "His genius, lofty and colossal in its creations like the sculpture of the land in which he dwelt, is obscure, unnatural, and profitless." He further says, "Supposing him (Philo) *to have been a Christian writer*, his testimony to the *Divine generation of the Logos proves it to have been a doctrine of the apostolic age.*" This puts on the topstone of absurdity, by Treffry, as to the source from whence he gleaned, in support of the doctrine of divine generation. He might as well have said, if fallacy is truth, we have no call for the Bible; or if the black crow is white, then there are no black birds at all. Does not gleaning from such a source prejudice his case? Our theological associates in reference to the doctrine of God, and of Christ, from a standard by which our own theological character is measured. "He that walketh with wise men shall be wise, but a companion of fools shall be destroyed, (Proverbs 13-20.) It is disgraceful for a Christian writer to claim Philo as authority for the doctrine of generation in the God-head, against which absurdity the inspired word is vocal—Isaiah 43, 10-11, &c., &c.

When Philo does not speak the words that suit Treffry, he takes the liberty to divine Philo's thoughts. On page 80, as follows, "The natural conclusion from his silence is, that while Philo considered the Logos and the Son of God of identical application, he had no conception that the glorious being thus designated would ever become incarnated, or that the Messiah and the Son of God could be one and the same person." He tells us above that Philo had no reference to the Messiah—no indications that in any sense he waited for the consolation of Israel. We would present the question to the enlightened reader, that presents itself to our mind, and request him to answer it to himself if he can, whether is Philo as above described by Treffry, or Treffry himself, most ignorant of God and Christ, according to the scriptures? He therefore tries to make Philo's silence prove his theory: who would be at a loss for witnesses if such evidence would pass in court?

The above is a specimen of the character Treffry gives of Philo, and he further says of him on page 59, "But the writings of Philo,—they are therefore in many respects the *most valuable aids* to the present part of our investigation *which we can command.*" Hence Philo is his stronghold, as before intimated; the character and doctrinal views of our associates become the standard by which our own theological character is measured, in reference to the knowledge of God and of Christ. The inspired writers could give him no help in making out his point as to the phrases needed; his doctrine is a transaction altogether outside the Bible; he gets no materials inside as to terms or phrases suitable for his purpose; in all his objectionable propositions he labours

to establish ; and his mean theory is objectionable ; he cannot in one instance say thus saith the Lord, but he tries to say, thus saith Philo, whether by saying or by silence. The doctrine in question solely belongs to and points, according to traditional teachings, to the pre-existent divine nature of Christ, and the burthen of its effort concentrates in one point, and that is to deny proper divinity to Christ Jesus. The New Testament gives him all the fulness of the God-head bodily by hypostatical union ; but this doctrine gives him but one-third of the God-head, and that by communication from another. Are these differences trival or trifling, as Treffry says they are in his preface to his book ? There is not more difference between light and darkness, between right and wrong, than there is between Treffry tradition and the Bible, relative to God and Christ.

Choosing Philo in preference to St. Paul for terms and phrases on which to base the doctrine in question, carries with it its own condemnation ; for an inspired writer never used the terms which he gleans from Philo, which he thinks are favourable to divine generation, whether they be Eternal Father, Eternal Son, three persons, Trinity, Divine generation, or Triune God, these terms are each of them dependent on and arise out of each other ; and when these terms are not found inside the Bible, he goes to Philo for them. For neither angel, patriarch, prophet or apostle, ever spoke or wrote the terms above referred to. "I have given them the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them," saith Jesus ; but the above terms God never gave ; they are human coinage by uninspired men, forced on us by tradition.

Do Treffry's pupils ever think that it is only a professed Christian that can preach anti-christian doctrine, that is, entertain and propagate opinions of Christ Jesus that are not true ? Jews deny that Christ has come ; Heathens know nothing about Him. There were many anti-Christian teachers in St. John's day, who went out from the Apostles, whom the Apostles described as deceivers ; though they preached Christ, they misrepresented Him. Treffry does not seem to think there could be such men in the Apostles' day, or any other day ; but he seems to think that any man, Jew or Heathen, or professed Christian, may say what he pleases about the divine nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, or Son of God, and if it savours of divine generation, he will willingly endorse it as genuine.

But the Holy Scriptures teach us in reference to the true sacrifice by which the world was redeemed, "Christ our passover was sacrificed for us—(1 Cor. 5-7)," even proper humanity, and not a divine sacrifice. The complex character of our Lord Jesus Christ becomes an altar on which the redeemed race may cast their individual souls by faith, and obtain a sanctity thereby that *meetens* for glory. Hence the error found in the doctrine in question, which imposes the belief on listening multitudes, that "God for a guilty world hath died." "The great Creator died." "The God of angels died," &c. We are sure the Bible does not teach so.

Jesus, my great high priest,
Offered His blood and died,
My guilty conscience seeks,
No sacrifice beside,
His powerful blood did once atone,
And now it pleads before the Throne.

Hence we say it was not a divine sacrifice, but God provided the sacrifice which suited the demands of the case, which was found in the seed of the woman, the Virgin's son; he had blood to shed; he had a corporeal body which could become extinct; in him humanity suffered, bled and died; hence God did not die. The Rev. Richard Watson vindicates this principle in his Institutes, Vol. I, page 623 4, "And the heterodox know that *we neither believe that God nor the Lord could die. God himself—His nature was incapable of death.*" This is Watson's sentiment on the subject: this is his own independent view, which accords with scripture and right reason; but the reception of the doctrine in question necessitates its adherents to a denial of this, and compels them to say and sing the untruthful assertion,—“God for a guilty world hath died.”

The multitude who with inspired tongues vindicate this sentiment, that Jesus' blood is the redemption price in connection with his mangled body, in opposition to a divine (or spirit) sacrifice, are as a cloud of witnesses. Hear their imperishable language:—"Thou hast redeemed us to God by the blood;" "which He has purchased with his own blood." "Being justified by his blood." "Made peace through the blood of his Cross." "Without shedding of blood there is no remission." "Into the holiest by the blood of Jesus." "With the precious blood of Christ." "His blood cleanseth us from all sin." "Washed in His own blood." "Made white in the blood of the Lamb." "For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls: *for it is the blood that maket an atonement for the soul,*" Lev. 17-11. This is the sacrifice inspiration guides us to as the redemption price. Now, in view of these things, who would be the pupil of tradition, and be led thereby to accept rival sacrifice that had no blood to shed? Such is spirit of any kind.

We therefore conclude that is a great mistake to believe that it was a divine sacrifice that died to redeem us. Let the Bible student look at it from whatsoever scriptural stand point he may, he will see its absurdity. The construction commonly put on that passage of Scripture—Acts 20-28,—“which he has purchased with his own blood,” is commonly said to be the blood of God. This is calculated to mislead the simple. It was the blood of Christ in his complex nature; for the invisible God had no blood to shed; the Son of God in his union with the Father had blood, and it was shed when in that union with the Father; in this the blood of Christ had its merit.

Therefore, in believing that it was a Divine or spirit sacrifice, is it not as poestive a mistake in reference to the true sacrifice that

died to redeem, as there would have been discoverable in the sacrifice of the Jewish Passover, had the Jew selected the young of the ass, or the elephant, or swine, instead of the young of the sheep or goat? They would only have been wrong in selecting a sacrifice which God did not appoint; had they done this, we may conjecture what would have been the result in their case. Hence it is a great mistake to say God for a guilty world hath died, as before said; we are sure the Bible does not say so. Watson in his Institutes further says,—Page 624—“All modern sects of Christians agree in admitting that the greatest benefits arise to us from the Saviour of the world being man.” Watson further says what involves a deep truth, on page 453,—“The God of those who deny the Trinity is not the God of those who worship the Trinity; so that one or the other worship what is nothing in the world.” He further says:—“We are between the extremes of pure and acceptable devotion, and of grace and offensive idolatry, and must run to one or the other *if the doctrine of the Trinity be true.*” Equally so, if the doctrine of the *Trinity be false.*

CHAPTER XIII.

MISREPRESENTATION CORRECTED.

Another great error has wonderfully obtained in reference to the death of our Lord Jesus Christ, and has been frequently preached to us from the pulpit. That the Father forsook the Son on the cross; and it is given as proof our Lord's words, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me.” Now, we think if it was so that the Father forsook the Son in the hour of the world's atonement, that the world would not be redeemed yet. But “God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses to them.” What God has joined together in the atonement let no man attempt to put asunder. My reader may ask, and what did his exclamation on the cross mean; if the Father did not forsake the Son? The corporeal part of our Lord Jesus Christ, several times before he came to the cross, was so overwhelmed by mental sufferings, that he felt sorrowful even unto death, as in Matt. 26, 37-38, and Luke 22, 42-44, and in Hebrews 5, 7. “Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared.” Angels ministered to him and strengthened him on these occasions, and humanity continued to survive. But now he is come to the cross; his hour is now come, and when nailed to the cross; the same humanity that on former occasions, when sorrowful unto death, had prayed to him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared, cry's again to his Father and God, for relief as heretofore; but no relief comes; for this end he came into the world. Humanity—corporeal nature must die, must become extinct; the intellectual spirit must leave the house of clay; and under these circumstance he cries, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?”—thou who ministered to

me at other times ; but no relief for corporeal nature ; the blood which is the life of the flesh is being poured out. Now the prediction is being fulfilled : “ awake a sword against my shepherd,” Zech. 13, 7 ; now the hour is come in which he is to taste death for every man ; and now there is no support or escape for corporeal nature, the corporeal man Christ must die ; animal life must become extinct, for the intellectual spirit cannot die, nor was spirit of any kind required to die ; spirit of any kind cannot become extinct, either angel or man, but is as defiant of extinction as God himself ; the intellectual spirit must leave the corporeal body : and he cried, “ it is finished, and bowed his head and gave up the Ghost.” Exacted is the legal pain and required death ; the world of mankind is redeemed. But did the Divine nature leave the intellectual spirit of the Son of God when or before he dismissed his spirit from the dying body on the cross ? No ; God was in the intellectual spirit going to Paradise, where he promised to meet the dying thief that day ; yea, and from the conception in the womb, to the cross, and from the cross to the throne, before which he appears in the presence of God for us ; the blessed Jesus could ever say :—“ The Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the works.” John 14, 10. The finite mind has no right to attempt to explain this union ; “ this holy thing is covered, we should not attempt to look in.” Numbers 4, 20.

CHAPTER XIV.

WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST, WHOSE SON IS HE ?

Seeing that we reject on scriptural grounds in the use of right reason, even the existence of an Eternal Son, my reader may feel inclined to ask me the very proper question which the blessed Jesus asked his audience, Matt. 22, 42, saying, “ What think ye of Christ, whose Son is he ?”

In order to give a proper answer to this question, we must be directed by the holy scriptures (not by tradition.) The scriptures exhibit to us the Redeemer of the world in a threefold point of view, each part of which must be considered in itself, and also in its relation to the other ? First; as God the maker and governor of the world, (Isaiah 43, 10 11.)—“ before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me ; I, even I, am the Lord, and besides me there is no Saviour.” This is proper Divinity ; God originates the plan of our redemption, and in carrying it out, he takes hold of the very humanity that sinned, and finds in it a substance suitable which he uses in connection with his own mercy and power as a redeeming sacrifice ; this is pointed to in the first promise given to the first unhappy pair ; “ the seed of the woman.” (Gen. 3, 15, and Gala. 3, 8,)—preached before the Gospel to Abraham, saying, “ In thee shall all nations be blessed ;” and verse 16,—“ Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many ; but as of *one*. And to *thy seed*, WHICH IS CHRIST.” The scripture here calls Christ, the seed of Abraham, by Isaac. “ In Isaac shall thy seed be called,” and it calls the seed of Abraham, “ CHRIST,”—“ *which seed is CHRIST.*”

“Whose Son is he?” It is *seen here*, in scripture language, the son of Abraham. This is the proper humanity. Now we have proper Divinity, and proper humanity scripturally exhibited to us as the Saviour of men. We may further notice as the lineage by which Christ came, he was the root of David, in the person of Jesse his Father, and the offspring of David in the person of Solomon, &c. See Isaiah 11, 1; “and there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots,” and Revelation 5, 5, “*Behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah*, the root of David.”—Jesus Christ springs from this tribe as his genealogy proves; see on Matt, 1 and Luke 3. “Dr. Clarke says there is an allusion here to Gen. 39, 9. “*Judah is a Lion’s whelp*,” the *Lion* was the emblem of this tribe, and was supposed to have been embroidered on its ensigns.” The lineage is traceable down through generation after generation until the blessed Virgin made her appearance, of whose seed according to the promise “in the fulness of time God sent forth *his son made of a woman*,”—(IN TIME *not in past eternity, as tradition says*); “he was made under the law,” “to redeem them that were under the (curse of a broken) Law.” The same principle is still further seen in Acts 2, 30:—“Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the *flesh*, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne.” The inspired writers with uniform caution and clearness, point out proper humanity in Christ, distinguishing between the corporeal and intellectual natures of Christ; they claim kindred with the corporeal nature of Christ, but not with the intellectual spirit of Christ. The inspired writers are uniform in this; God swore to David that of the fruit of his loins according to the *flesh*, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne. St. Paul claims kindred in this sense with Christ’s corporeal nature also; “For we are members of his body, of his *flesh*, and of his bones.” Eph. 5, 30. “God sending his own Son in the *likeness* of sinful *flesh*, and for sin, condemned sin in the *flesh*.” Rom. 8, 3. “Whose are the Father’s, and of whom as concerning the *flesh*, Christ came.” Rom. 9, 5. “For as much, then, as the children are partakers of *flesh* and *blood*, he himself likewise took *part* of the *same*; that through *death* he might *destroy* him that had the *power* of death, that is the devil.” Heb. 2, 14. The reason is more clearly seen in this, that the intellectual spirit of Christ that went from the cross to Paradise, in accordance with his promise to the penitent thief, this intellectual spirit of Christ, our second Adam, was *not a descendant* of our first Adam, as is the spirit of Adam’s posterity; all individuals that are born of a woman according to the natural course of human propagation, are kindred spirits, on the principle that man propagates his own species in reference to the intellectual spirit, as well as the body; this intellectual germ is propagated by the male parent; posterity is reckoned from the male parent; the scriptures are vocal on this. On this principle the seed of the woman has no intellectual germ in it; consequently the seed of the male parent is the source through which intellectual life, with all its contamination of universal

depravity, is traceable, as the channel through which Adam's depravity is transmitted with universal application to the race; now, on this true principle the seed of the woman is as free from Adam's contamination, as the Virgin earth out of which the body of our first parent Adam was made; to this uncontaminated seed the first promise points,—Gen. 3, 15. God would not use contaminated material in the formation of the sacrificial Lamb he provided:—John 1, 29; contamination in him, or the seed of which he was made, would have been a blemish, that would have rendered him unfit for the hallowed purpose of redeeming the world; hence in his intellectual spirit, he has no kindred relation to our first fallen Adam, and still as pertaining to his corporeal nature, he is of the seed of Abraham, according to the flesh, and the root and offspring of David, in the Regal line, according to promise: Acts 2, 30; for he was of the stock or offspring of David as to his *human nature*, for that he took of the stock of David, becoming thereby heir to the Jewish throne, and the only heir which then existed; and it is remarkable that the whole regal family terminated in Christ, and as he liveth forever, he is the only true David and everlasting King. *Dr. Clark!* The necessary importance of the fulfilment of the promises that went before of him as the coming Saviour, to come of the seed of Abraham, of David, and of the seed of a Virgin, he gives evidence of the truthful fulfilment of these predictions in his revelations of himself to St. John. Rev. 22, 16. “I, Jesus, have sent my Angel to testify unto you these things in the churches; I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.” Hence the only name given under Heaven amongst men by which we must be saved. The above are among the reasons why he is called the Son of man, in that he has come according to the flesh, of the seed of the Patriarchs, and Kingly Prophets, &c. Now as to why he is equally called the Son of God we further remark:—

In reference to human propagation, our second Adam, Christ, is not a descendant of our first Adam, for the production and perpetuation of posterity is dependant on sexual intercourse; the intellectual germ is the offspring of the male parent. Now, these laws have not governed the blessed Virgin; she had never known a man in the above sense of the word; male intervention was not admitted; the Holy Ghost came upon the Virgin in the mighty power of the most high, and produced the promised seed in the proper locality. This is what the scriptures call begotten; God never begot a being in this way before, nor since, nor ever will; he, Christ, or Son of God, is the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. He had a human mother, but no human Father; God was his Father; begotten in no ways analagous to human propagation; there was no amalgamation of natures in the production of the human body of Christ, he was *made* of the seed of the woman; (Gal. 4, 4.)

As there is no intellectual germ in the seed of the woman, therefore the rational spirit of which Christ was possessed must have come from the same source whence the rational spirit of our

first Adam came,—God supplied it, and for the same reason why our first Adam is called the Son of God (Luke 3, 38) as his author and maker, equally so is our second Adam Christ, called the Son of God, for he had no human Father. As our first Adam was a federal head to propagate the race, even so in our second Adam a federal to redeem the race; hence he has his intellectual spirit immediately from God, as our first Adam had; neither the first Adam, nor our second Adam, Christ, had their intellectual spirit by propagation, like Adam's posterity has, for they had no human Father. Christ was the only existent intelligence in the universe that was both begotten and made. Our first parents were made; they had neither human Father nor mother; God was their Father, by immediate creation; Christ had a human mother, he was made of her seed, and she gave birth to him, as "the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Now we think we have pointed out to some satisfaction what the scriptures teach as to whose son Christ is, as to his corporeal and intellectual nature and relations.

In carrying out the proposition we commenced with, namely, that the scripture exhibited the Redeemer of the world to us in a threefold point of view, we consider we have shown his proper Divinity and equally so his proper humanity; it now remains that we point out the union of these two proper natures, by a complex or hypostatical union of an unexplainable nature, centering in that glorious personage our Lord Jesus Christ. In Isaiah 7, 14,—*"Behold a Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call his name Immanuel, that is God with us;"* here is the union of human and Divine natures in our Immanuel. Isaiah 9, 6;—*"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the Government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace."* Here is humanity and divinity in a complex union. 2 Cor. 5, 19.—*"God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself."* Col. 2, 9. *"For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."* Heb. 2, 16. *"For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham."* Now we think these are quite sufficient to establish the point. In addition to this, we have the blessed Jesus' own sanction for these views above given, expressed by him in several places. He points to his proper humanity in John 12, 49-50.—*"But the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak, and I know that his commandment is life everlasting. Whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me so I speak."* John 14, 28.—*"My Father is greater than I."* John 14, 10.—*"The Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the works."* Mark 13, 31.—*"But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."* We might enumerate, but the above is sufficient. He also exhibits to us his complex nature, John 14, 9.—*"He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."* Verse 10.—*"I am in the Father, and the Father in*

me." John 10, 30.--"I and my Father are one."—"Where two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." When he speaks in his complex character he claims omnipresence, and all the attributes of omnipotence; though he says I and my Father are one in his complex character, yet he says, "my Father is greater than I;" "the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works;" he does not attribute any miracle to the man Christ, but as to his union with the Father, in his complex character he thought it not robbery to be equal with God. The Father gave not the spirit by measure to him, in him dwelleth all the fullness of the God-head bodily.

Now we think it is wrong to say in an unqualified sense that Christ is God; for the seed of Abraham (Gala. 3, 16,) was not God; nor the term Christ, in 1 Cor., mentioned some 13 times by the apostle when proving the death, and resurrection of Christ, did not mean God, but merely the man Christ Jesus; hence it is needful for us who teach in Jesus' name to understand the scriptural distinctions given to us of Christ; that we exhibit the Lamb of God in his true character, whether in his proper humanity, or in his complex nature; this being understood by us, we dare not say nor teach that God died. This misrepresents the true sacrifice.

Now, it is to be distinctly understood, that the scriptures speak sometimes distinctly of the human nature of the complex character of God manifest in the flesh, as the Christ, as follows:—"There is but one God and one mediator between God and men, the MAN Christ Jesus;" "If I had not done among them the works which none other MAN did, they had not had sin." "By *man* came death, by *man* came also the resurrection of the dead." "My Father is greater than I." "The Father that dwelleth in ME, he doeth the works, &c., &c." It is equally seen that the scriptures speak of Christ in his Hypostatical union with the Father; "I and my Father are ONE;" "they that have seen ME have seen the FATHER ALSO;" "where two or three are met together in MY NAME, there am I in the midst of them," &c., &c. This union of human and Divine natures in the Messiah does not form two persons;" "*I and my Father are ONE.*" This was predicted by the Prophets (Isa. 7, 14, and 9, 6), and is acknowledged as being fulfilled by the prophets; He, the Word, that was God, took not on him the nature of Angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham; God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.

Hence, we being guided by scripture are led to conclude that this Son of man, this Son of God, this Christ, came in the flesh (not sooner,) not in past eternity, before time or flesh, as the doctrine in question teaches, that Christ came from Heaven as an Eternal Son. We are sure the Bible does not teach so. It is further urged in favour of the doctrine in question, that the Father gave and sent his Son to be the Redeemer of the World, and it is alleged that these terms mean that he was originated in past eternity, even in the eternal God-head, and that he must have come

from past eternity, even from Heaven. Now, this construction of the above terms is contrary to all scripture guidance ; the following scripture is proof :—In John 1, 6, we have an example. “There was a man sent from God whose name was John.” Will any man say that John came from Heaven, or from past eternity, on the ground he was sent from God ? The meaning is, he was God’s messenger, commissioned of God to do and teach as he did ; he had God’s authority for what he said and did.

God’s ministerial officials in and for the Church militant, are somewhat analogous to national officials. According to the laws of the state, whether the candidate admitted into office as a Judge or Magistrate, ever saw the King or the Governor, as sent by him, or not he is possessed with the King’s authority to decree Justice as much so as if he had his commission delivered to him by the Sovereign in person, and he is the King’s confidential servant, waiting on this office in the King’s name ; this makes his righteous decisions lawful ; suppose he never saw the King, he comes with his authority as sent by the King ; hence, with great propriety, the apostle John says, “there was a man sent from God, whose name was John ;” the meaning is he was God’s messenger, commissioned of God to do and teach as he did : Again, “We know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him,” (John 3-2.) Now this has the same meaning as the above passage ; here, he came from God, and yet God was with him. The term *came from* God implies that he had God’s presence and authority, and approbation, in and for what he did ; this form of speech the Jews were in the habit of using to denote that they came not merely in their own name, independent of God, but that they had God’s authority and presence with them as his messengers. We find the same principle and form of speech made use of in John 16, 27-30,—“*I came out from God.*” *I came forth from the Father ;*” “because the Father is with me.” Also in John 17 14-16, —“Because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world ;” “as thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world.” Verse 20, “Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe in me through their word.” 21, “That they all may be *one* ; as *thou. Father*, art *in me*, and *I in thee* ; that they also may be *one in us* ; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.” The above scripture proves the sense of the terms in question to any honest Bible student, and enlightened common sense rescues them from vindicating that Christ or Son of God came from Heaven to die to redeem us, as the doctrine in question teaches.

Therefore, we think it is a great mistake, extremely dangerous, to believe or teach that the Son of God, the Lord’s Christ, came from past eternity, and that he left the bosom of the Father in doing so. This denies omnipresence to the God of the Universe, and denies proper divinity to the complex character of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is anti-christian, and Arianism of the rankest character.

Hence the above is an epitome of what we think of Christ.

whose son He is. As to Him being called the Son of Man, it is owing to his fleshly or corporeal nature, as to his genealogy traceable in accordance with the first promise (Gen. 3, 15) down from our first parents to Abraham, thence to King David, thence to the blessed Virgin, of whose seed, as above noticed, his corporeal body was made.

And as to him being called the Son of God, the following reasons appear:—He had no human Father; the Power of the Highest overshadowed the blessed Virgin, and produced the promised seed in the proper locality; this is what the scripture calls *begotten*; and of this seed, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, made the human body of the *Man* Christ Jesus, and as above noticed, the seed of the woman having no intellectual germ in it, the intellectual spirit of the Virgin's son must have come from the same source whence the intellectual spirit of our first Adam's came. God breathed into him the breath of life; in this sense of the word, God was as much the Father of our second Adam as he was of our first Adam; neither of them had a human Father; God was their Father, their Maker, their God. Christ has a pre-eminence above all other existences, in that he was both begotten and made; he was made of a woman, (Gal. 4, 4), and the only begotten of the Father (John 1, 14); being guided therefore by the Scriptures, this is what we think of Christ as to whose son he is; and we renounce and denounce the traditional eternal son. We don't denounce him as a pretender, for he never had an existence; but it is his conjectural originators and adherents, that are chargeable with presenting a rival against the true Son of God; all such should compare their character with Rev. 22 18-19.

CHAPTER XV.

REMARKS RELATIVE TO THE REV. JOHN WESLEY.

I would take the liberty here of answering an enquiry that may very probably arise in the mind of my reader, namely: How is it that you professing to be a Methodist, and holding an official standing in that body of professed Christians for over fifty years, retain your relation to them, while you are writing against one of their most prominent doctrines, namely, the Eternal Sonship of Christ? I answer by giving the following reason:—First, the love I have for all the standard doctrines preached among the Methodists, with the exception of the doctrine in question, believing them to be scriptural. Secondly, a desire to throw out a healthy influence among those I call my brethren in the Lord; and thirdly, speaking in a sectarian point of view, in almost every other sect, the doctrinal objection is to be found in their creeds and confessions; so that considering the whole matter, I think myself better where I am than I could be elsewhere. God converted my soul the 14th day of March, in the year 1819, in old Ireland, by the instrumentality of Methodism; before which time I had never given one serious thought to the doctrine in question; and

the fourth and last reason, yet not the least, is that I believe that it is not Wesleyan doctrine, nor scriptural doctrine. I make this assertion fearless of successful contradiction. It is not Wesleyan doctrine. I take the venerable Wesley for my witness ; though he is dead, he yet speaketh ; the following explanation is indisputable proof ; let the objector examine how he exposes and destroys its foundation in the following way :—

It is not my intention to say much in reference to the venerable Wesley ; his praise is in all the churches ; but this every man will admit, that he knew more when he was 80 years old than when he was 40. John Wesley was born and educated a member of the Church of England. His father was a minister in said Church, and he was inducted into the Ministry of said Church. As a pious youth, he received the doctrines of said Church with implicit confidence as to their truthfulness, among which the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of Christ held a prominent position. These doctrines he preached and defended and expounded, without the least suspicion of their fallacy, till his head whitened in the Ministry, interspersing his explanations and defence of it in his sermons, and notes on the New Testament, and hymns.

And toward the close of his useful life, his son in the Gospel, the venerable Dr. Adam Clark, in publishing his commentary on the Bible, exposed and disproved the doctrine in question ; which no doubt led Mr. Wesley to examine the doctrine with care. He was now well up to 80 years of age ; and it clearly appears that he perceived the doctrine was unscriptural, and that it was the foundation of Arianism. Age now forbade an attempt on his part to publish in the Church a personal retraction of his former sentiments on this subject, lest it would unhinge the consolidated unity of the Church ; and what was to be done ? It appears that he considered it his duty as a dying Minister, to write an article expressive of his faith on this subject, as to his views being changed, a few years before his death, entitled "An Arian Antidote," by which he wisely escaped as an old man all polemic strife as to why he renounced the doctrine in question ; for he would have had antagonists had he come out vocally on the subject ; the opposition Dr. Clark met with is proof.

He being induced to examine the doctrine in question for himself with care scripturally, from what Dr. Clark wrote on the subject, it appears that he clearly perceived that the doctrine had its origin and perpetuation in unscriptural principles, which he found it his duty to renounce ; namely : First, that there is greater and lesser in infinity ; secondly, that there is inferior Godhead, and thirdly, that our Redeemer from everlasting had the inferior name of Son.

Wesley saw, and so may any man see, that in examining the doctrines scripturally these are the three principles on which the doctrine is based, and that they are the sole foundation of Arianism. The doctrine of Arianism consists principally in a belief that the divine nature of our Lord Jesus Christ is inferior in some degree to the Heavenly Father, (Buck's Theological dic-

tionary); and he, Mr. Wesley, writes an article entitled "An Arian Antidote," referred to by the Rev. Adam Clark, D. D., in his commentary (in the latest revision for a new edition), to be found in the concluding remarks on the first of Hebrews, which is as follows:—In 1781, Rev. John Wesley published in the fourth volume of the Arminian Magazine, page 348, an article entitled "An Arian Antidote," in which are the following words:—(Let the objector examine). Greater or lesser in infinity is not; inferior God-head shocks our sense,—John 14-28, He was a son given, and slain intentionally from the foundation of the world, Rev. 13-8, and the first born from the dead of every creature; Col. 1, 15-16, but our Redeemer from everlasting had not the inferior name of Son. In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God from eternity, and the word made flesh was God."

This is pointedly against the eternal sonship of the divine nature of Christ. But why did Mr. Wesley insert this? and if by haste, &c., why did he not correct it when he published in 1790, in the thirteenth volume of the Magazine, eight tables of errata to the first eight volumes of the work. Now, although he had carefully noticed the slightest errors that might affect the sense in these preceding volumes, yet no fault is found with the reasons in the Arian Antidote, and the sentence, "But our Redeemer from everlasting had not the inferior name of Son." This is passed by without the slightest notice.

The above is proof positive to the unprejudiced reader, that the inherent principles of the doctrine in question were rejected by the venerable Wesley, before he died, and as such, the doctrine in question cannot be called Wesleyan doctrine, for two indisputable reasons:—namely, first, he received it originally handed to him as a youth, and secondly, he renounced the doctrine before he died; as the article above referred to is proof; so that Wesley's Ministerial followers, to be truly Wesleyan on this doctrine, must of necessity renounce it, as did Wesley in the above article.

Again, what legal grounds have Methodists to claim this doctrine to be Wesleyan doctrine? where did Wesley get it? he got it in the formulas of the Church of England; and where did the Church of England get it? The great reformer Luther obtained it in Popery, but did not shake it off with other errors in coming out of that corrupt Church; and his contemporary, Calvin, the founder of the Presbyterian Church, also brought the doctrine of a generated Deity with its concomitants out from Popery also; and Popery obtained it from the Judeising teachers that appeared in the Christian Church, in the Apostolic day, who would not give a truthful exhibition of Christ to the people; they preached the doctrine in question; the apostles opposed them, and denounced them as deceivers, and they went out from the Apostles, and would teach and preach their wrong views of Christ, which were exactly the principles of the doctrine in question, as exposed by the Apostle John in his Epistles. In his first epistle, 4th Chapter, three first verses, and in his second epistle, verse 7, 9, they con-

fessed not that Jesus Christ came in the flesh ; they taught like the doctrine now teaches, that Jesus Christ came in past eternity, before time or flesh ; that he was originated in the eternal God-head, and came from thence as Jesus Christ, and left the bosom of the Father, and came down to earth to die to redeem us. This is exactly the heresy St. John points to "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." This is a deceiver, and an antichrist." Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the (true) doctrine of Christ, hath not God (in his Christ). He that abideth in the (true) doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." "Hath not God," does not apply to the transgressor's personal experience, but to the doctrinal view he gives of Christ. Has the Eternal Son the Father in him ? No : he has left the bosom of the Father, so the doctrine in question teaches ; "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house (as a teacher) neither bid him God-speed,—For he that biddeth him God-speed is a partaker of his evil deeds, John 2nd Epistle."

Hence, there is no good reason why it should be called Wesleyan doctrine, or Lutheran, or Calvinistic, for the founders of either sects cannot take the credit or discredit of originating the doctrine in question ; for it is more especially Popish than Protestant reform. It is a species of the mystery of iniquity that has eat vital godliness out of Popery, and was not cut off by the Reformers, but was carried into the Protestant Church, and it is blighting the pure spirit of Protestantism, and should be cut off ; it is Ritualising Protestantism, and it is destined to do so, and it is doing its work.

But sad to say, the British Conference have bound themselves in adamant chains in passing the test act on this subject, and consequently are not Wesleyan on this doctrine. For Wesley's writings in the way of defending the doctrine in the early part of his life, found in his notes on the New Testament, and his sermons and Hymns, are attributable to his reception of the doctrine in his youth, as contained in the formulas of the Church of England, as before noticed ; and his renouncing the principles of the doctrine before he died, is proof that it is not Wesleyan doctrine. They who are truly Wesleyan on this doctrine feel cause of thankfulness that the blessed Lord abundantly honoured Wesley among men in convincing him before he died of the error of the doctrine, which led him to renounce its principles, as above noticed, in the article referred to, where he leaves the unretracted assertions :—"Greater and lesser in Infirmary are not ; inferior God-head shocks our sense ; our Redeemer from everlasting had not the inferior name of Son ; yet it is lamentable that there are so many of his Ministerial followers that have not allowed themselves to examine the subject like the venerable Wesley did near the close of his valuable life, the result of which we notice above ; and if many of them have examined the subject as did Wesley, and are as convinced as was Wesley, they are putting their light

(as it were) under a bushel, in not coming out as did Wesley, in denouncing the internal principles of said doctrine, as did Mr. Wesley in the article above referred to; and don't seem to be in dread of incurring the penalty, "to him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin."

To reject truth, and hold to error, is the greatest source of blight the nominal Church of Christ is dwarfed with; they that receive light and truth, and don't exhibit it, are in danger of being abandoned to judicial blindness, so as to lose the relish for truth, and be snared into readily believing a lie. Setting an undue estimate on the judgment of the mistaken multitude, forms self-shackles, which blinds the mind like grasping a forbidden object. The youthful minister is ~~not~~ easily tempted to not let his light shine in reference to this subject, lest ministerial seniority should lay stumbling blocks in the way of his juvenile progress, and he be dealt with according to the principles of the test act. Man is subject to temptation on this ground; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh.

It is further manifest, we say, that there is some sectarian soil so polluted with other obnoxious theological weeds of a most wild description, so well cultivated by human art, as to render such sectarian soil very congenial to this spurious, darkening, God-dishonouring doctrine of a generated deity. I hope the ministry and membership in every branch of the Christian Church will sincerely, and prayerfully consider these things, and expunge from their theology that anti-christian principle of a generated Deity; and God will use them more extensively than ever in the conversion of the human family; and I am further constrained to think and say that if the present theology which now overspreads the land, found in the doctrine in question, remains unchanged, God will raise up another people; should he dig them out of the mountain, sooner or later, let them be called by whatever name they may, who will embrace and retain a pure scriptural theology, and individually, and faithfully confess that Jesus Christ came in the flesh (not sooner) in St. John's sense of the word, as above referred to, exhibited in his epistles.

Men talk about the second advent of Christ, and say that he is to be expected to come and reign on earth with his saints for a thousand years; their sentiments, as they advance them, convey ideas contrary to scripture; if the Christian Church would unite in believing and confessing that Jesus Christ came in the flesh, in St. John's sense of the word, as above referred to, then it would be as it ought to be, a denial of the spurious doctrine of a generated Deity, and this would be more worthy the appellation of the second advent of Christ, in as much as all branches of the Christian Church since the apostolic age, who have received the traditional doctrine in question, have only preached Christ truthfully, commencing at the incarnation. The pre-existence of his Divine nature was by them misunderstood, and consequently misrepresented, discoverable in the doctrine of a generated Deity, giving Christ only the one-third of the God-head, even one imaginary

substance out of three ; whereas inspiration gives him all the fullness of the God-head bodily ; hence the necessity in this 19th century of a second advent of Christ in a more clear and full explanation of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in reference to the pre-existence of his Divine nature, prior to the incarnation of the Eternal Word, which posess Christ in his complex nature with all the fullness of the God-head bodily, and partially, as the doctrine in question enjoins. In the above, my reasons are found for writing against the doctrine in question, and remaining still in the Church of my choice, and I sincerely pray for the expunging of this heresy from the theology of Protestantism.

CHAPTER XVI.

SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION AS CANDIDATES FOR SUFFRAGE OF BIBLE STUDENTS ; AS TO WHICH PRESENTS THE TRUE SON OF GOD.

Meantime we shall take a condensed look at the contrast existing between the scripturally exhibited SON OF GOD, and the the traditionally exhibited *Eternal* Son of God. The name and characteristics of the Eternal Son are not found inside the Bible ; he is questionable on this ground as being an *alien*. The government of the Bible does not admit such candidates as a rival to the only name given under Heaven amongst men by which we must be saved ; even Jesus Christ of Nazareth, who was crucified, whom God raised from the dead, neither is there salvation in any other : (Acts 4, 10-12.)

Our blessed Lord teaches the redeemed race where they are to search, from whence to receive a true knowledge of himself ; " search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life ; and they are they which testify of me." John 5, 37. The scriptures know nothing of an Eternal Son ; it is a name the tongue or pen of Inspiration never spake or wrote ; hence he is not introduced in the language the Holy Ghost teacheth ; neither Prophetic predictions, nor Apostolic teachings knew anything of him.

The scriptural Son of God was " the only begotten of the Father." (John 1, 14-18.) The Eternal Son, tradition says, was twice begotten ; Bishop Pearson on the Creed, (page 26) so this cannot be the only begotten.

The scriptures point us to a Son of God who had a Virgin mother. (Luke 1, 31.) Tradition does not know, at least does not tell us who was the mother of the Eternal Son ; traditional conjecture could never point her out ; man that is born of a woman must be very credulous to believe that there is a son produced by generation who never had a mother.

The scriptural Son of God had two proper natures, human and Divine. (John 1, 1 ; Hebrews 2, 6. Gal. 3, 6. Rom. 1, 3. Isa. 7, 14.) The traditional Eternal Son had no proper nature at all, as being originated in past Eternity, he could have no human nature, and the principles of personality in the God-head try to teach that there are three subsistences in the God-head, and

the second is said to be the Eternal Son ; hence there are two other subsistencies said to be in the God-head, the Eternal Son is not possessed of ; consequently, he has not proper Divinity, so he has no proper nature, neither human nor divine. We may say of him as inspiration says of an idol, " we know that an idol is nothing in the world." (1 Cor. 8, 4.)

The scriptural Son of God had blood to shed. (Rev. 5, 9. 1 Peter, 1, 19.) The Eternal Son which tradition brings us, had no blood as such. Tradition tells us he existed from all eternity as spirit, for there was no humanity in the Eternal God-head prior to the incarnation ; hence they are two characters in this also.

The scriptural Son of God was made of a woman. (Gal. 4, 4. Phil. 2, 7.) The traditional Eternal Son was *not made*. (Athanasius' Creed Church of England Prayer-book.) So we see in this also that they have no more sympathy with each other than truth and error. The scriptural Son of God, in him dwelleth all the fullness of the God-head bodily. The Traditional Eternal Son had only the one-third of the God-head, and that by communication by another ; he is wanting in this also ; likewise in the attributes of eternity and self-existence, and independence, which are indispensably needful to proper Divinity.

The scriptural Son of God has the Father dwelling in him. (John 14, 10.) The traditional Eternal Son has left the bosom of the Father, and left the glories of heaven, and was sent down by the Father to die to redeem the world ; this is not the Son of God who has said " he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ;" the Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the works.

One that studied the Bible might think that traditional votaries might blush at such groundless fallacies. Where did the Eternal Son leave the Father ? does not this deny omnipresence to the God of the universe ; " in whom we live and move and have our being ;" for in the scriptural Son of God dwelleth all the fullness of the God-head bodily, not partially. In this the two characters appear also, as distinctly as light from darkness.

The scriptural Son of God said of himself, on the principles of the Hypostatical union of human and Divine natures, " I and my Father are one ;" but the traditional Eternal Son is not allowed this relation to the Father : Athanasius' Creed, Church of England Prayer-book tradition, enjoins a penalty of perishing everlastingly, if we confound the Divine natures of the Father and the Son ; they are two characters in this also.

The scriptural Son of God, on the principle of his complex character, said of himself, I am the first and I am the last ; but the traditional Son is denied this, for the doctrine in question makes him neither the first nor the last, but the second, on the principle of personality in the God-head : they are two characters in this also.

The scriptural Son of God could die, and did die ; Christ died for the ungodly. (Rom. 5, 6.) Christ died for our sins. (1 Cor. 15, 3.) He could not die on any other principle than being possessed of corporeal nature. The life of the flesh is in the

blood : — it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul. (Lev. 17, 11.) Blood the Eternal Son had not ; he is deficient here also.

The scriptural Son of God was to come of the seed of the woman, and was to be a Virgin's Son, having no human Father ; God was his Father, and he was to be born of a woman (Gen. 3, 15. Isa. 7, 14), and to come of the seed of Abraham (Gal. 3, 16), and down through the seed or lineage of David (Rom. 1, 3, &c.) The traditional Eternal Son we have nothing given to us from any source, as to the seed or lineage by which he came ; the Bible knows nothing of such a being ; he is presented not as the fulfillment of Prophecy ; he is not God-sent ; his name is not in Heaven's available library, the Holy Bible ; he is a production of human imagination ; so he is destitute of the credentials of the scriptural Son of God in these things also.

The scriptural Son of God not only died and rose again, "but appears in the presence of God for us," (Heb. 9, 24,) which he wrought in Christ, whom he raised from the dead, and set him at his own right hand, in the Heavenly places. (Eph. 1, 20.) By the which will we are sanctified through the *offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all*. (Heb. 10, 10.) The above idea of death, and of being raised from the dead ; apply it to the Eternal Son, and it outrages scripture and common sense ; apply it to the Virgin's Son, to the man Christ, and then we have as his God and Father one God, and one mediator between God and man, the MAN Christ Jesus.

The scriptural Son of God not only died, but God raised him from the dead ; the scriptures don't teach that Christ raised himself from the dead, but that his God and Father raised him, whom God hath raised up. (Acts 2, 24, and chapter 3, 5, and 4, 10, and 5, 30, and 10 40, and 13, 30.) By that MAN whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead. (Acts 17, 31.) Tradition tells us that he died as a man, and arose like a God. We are sure the scriptures don't say so of the scriptural Son of God ; while they say he died as a man, they also say he was raised as a man, and the Apostle Thomas with the rest of the Apostles is witness, the prints of the nails in his hands, the hole of the spear in his side is witness. "Handle me and see, a spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me have," is also witness that he was raised as a MAN. The Saviour himself applied the term Son to the human nature of the complex character of Christ ; Christ teaches the listening multitudes in reference to the day of Judgment ; he says, "of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father." (Mark 13, 32.) The Father never revealed to Angels, Prophets nor Apostles, nor even to the MAN Christ Jesus, when that day or that hour would come : it is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power. (Acts 1, 7.)

Apply this innocent ignorance to the imaginary Eternal Son as

being a person in the God-head; and it virtually implies that one of the persons is ignorant of the end from the beginning; then the Eternal Son has no claim to a share in the Divine God-head. "To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever, amen." The term Son is applied to proper humanity in 1st Cor. 15, 24, 28. "Then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." The offices of Redemption, Mediation, and Judge, have done their work; probation is ended; every one of Adam's race has received his reward. The Kingdom is now given up to the Father, "that God may be all in all," and the Son of the Virgin in his glorified humanity, now takes his place at the head of redeemed millions, who have obtained redemption through his blood, all of whom shall join in one eternal song of united praise; "for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred and tongue, and people, and nation—saying with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was *slain* to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever; and my heart doth say amen."

Now, ye pious Bible Students, we call on you in the name of your accountability to God, and the use you should make of your influence amongst men; in whose favor will you record your vote, as being the true Son of God? Whether the scripturally exhibited Son of God, as above pointed out, or the traditionally exhibited Eternal Son, as above noticed? Your decision will meet you at the Judgement Seat of Christ; may the Lord direct thy heart in thy decision.

We give the foregoing remarks to the public, praying God to bless them, as far as they are consistent with his will, to his name's glory, and the good of his Church.

ONTARIO, DOMINION OF CANADA, }
Innisfil, Sept. 15, 1869. }

THOMAS BLACK.

 The author permits any man to re-print and publish this pamphlet.—THOMAS BLACK.

PRICE 15 CENTS.

INDEX.

	PAGE.
CHAPTER I.—HIS MENTAL EXERCISE IN COMMENCING THIS WORK.....	4.
CHAPTER II.—HE ACKNOWLEDGES HIS INCAPABILITY TO EXAMINE THE DOCTRINE IN QUESTION	5.
CHAPTER III.—THE SILENCE OF SCRIPTURE ON THE SUBJECT.....	6.
CHAPTER IV.—PROPER DIVINITY	9.
CHAPTER V.—THE PROBABLE ORIGIN OF THE DOCTRINE IN QUESTION.	10.
CHAPTER VI.—OF THE TRINITY, AND DENIAL OF HOLINESS TO THE MAN CHRIST JESUS	13.
CHAPTER VII.—AN ABSURD ANALOGY, DRAWN BY TREFFRY, BETWEEN GOD AND HIS CREATURES	16.
CHAPTER VIII.—THE DOCTRINE OF SONSHIP AND TRINITY STAND OR FALL TOGETHER	19.
CHAPTER IX.—THE ORIGIN OF PERSONALITY IN THE GOD-HEAD BY ITS DEFENDERS.....	21.
CHAPTER X.—AN EXPLORING TOUR INTO PAST ETERNITY.....	23.
CHAPTER XI.—A SUGGESTION GIVEN, AND EGOTISM AND SLANDER EX- POSED.....	31.
CHAPTER XII.—BEHOLD THE SOURCE WHENCE TREFFRY OBTAINED HIS MOST VALUABLE AIDS.....	35.
CHAPTER XIII.—MISREPRESENTATION CORRECTED.....	40.
CHAPTER XIV.—WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST, WHOSE SON IS HE.....	41.
CHAPTER XV.—REMARKS RELATIVE TO THE REV. JOHN WESLEY.....	47.
CHAPTER XVI.—SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION AS CANDIDATES FOR SUP- PLACEMENT OF BIBLE STUDENTS; AS TO WHICH PRESENTS THE TRUE SON OF GOD.....	52.

ERRATA.

On the 25th line from the bottom, on the 15th page, the word *divine* should not be there.

On page 23, on the 9th line from the top, the word *denied* should be *divided*.

On 25th page, on 22nd line from top, the word *mocking* should be *making*.

On 27th page, 21st line from the bottom, the word *to* should be *not*.

On page 29, the second line from bottom, the word *our* should be *the*.

On page 37, the 7th line from top, the word *scripture* should be *sculpture*.

On page 38, 6th line from top, the word *his* should be *its*.

On page 52, 7th line from the top, the word *and* should be *not*.

